DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 897 HE 003 857

TITLE	Columbia University Affirmative Action Program (Condensed Version).
INSTITUTION	Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Dec 72
NOTE	61p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Civil Liberties; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Equal Protection; *Higher Education; *Program Descriptions; Racial Discrimination; Sex Discrimination

ABSTRACT

Columbia University's equal employment opportunity policy is reviewed in relation to officers of instruction and research, officers of administration and support staff, and procedures and programs. Part I reaffirms the policy, indicates dissemination of the policy and reviews the responsibility for implementation of the policy. The officers of instruction and research section covers Columbia's profile, goals, and procedures. Utilization analysis, salary analysis, and goals are reviewed in Part III. Procedures and policies and university programs supportive of equal opportunity are indicated in Part IV. Appendixes of related material and tables are included. (MJM)

ED 074897

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM
(CONDENSED VERSION)

December 1972

HEW 3853

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 074897

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM
(CONDENSED VERSION)

December 1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NOTE i

I. COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY'S EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY POLICY 1

- A. Reaffirmation of Policy
- B. Dissemination of Policy
- C. Responsibility for Implementation of Policy

II. OFFICERS OF INSTRUCTION AND RESEARCH 3

- A. Columbia's Profile
- B. Goals
- C. Procedures

III. OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORTING STAFF 8

- A. Utilization Analysis
- B. Salary Analysis
- C. Goals

IV. PROCEDURES AND PROGRAMS 21

- A. Procedures and Policies
- B. University Programs Supportive of Equal Opportunity

APPENDICES AND TABLES 27

NOTE

Columbia University's Affirmative Action Program was submitted to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on April 10, 1972, revised on April 30, 1972, and accepted by the Office of Civil Rights of the Department on September 8, 1972. Copies of this Program are available for inspection by members of the Columbia community in the Reference Room of Butler Library on the Morningside Campus, in the Medical School Library at the College of Physicians and Surgeons, at the Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory, in the Personnel offices, and in the offices of Deans of the University.

In order to reach a wider audience both within the Columbia community and outside it, the University has prepared for distribution to interested parties this condensed version of the Affirmative Action Program. In this version, sections dealing with the administrative structure of the University (Part II of the complete Program) have been eliminated, and many of the exhibits and tables in the complete program have not been reproduced. In addition, there has been some reorganization of the materials presented.

It is important to note that the salary and employment analyses on which the Program is based reflect the employment profile of the University prevailing on December 31, 1971. No changes in employment or salaries since that date have been incorporated. Annual updating of profiles and goals is stipulated in Columbia's Affirmative Action Program; as of this date (December 15, 1972), such updating is in progress, using Columbia's salaries and employment prevailing on September 30, 1972.

Since the submission of the Affirmative Action Program, the Trustees of Columbia University have created the office of Vice President for Personnel Management. This office, which will be filled in January, 1973, will have significant responsibilities in functions ascribed in the Program to the Director of Personnel.

I. COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY'S EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY POLICY

A. Reaffirmation of Policy

Columbia University reaffirms its longstanding commitment both to the principle of equal employment opportunity regardless of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin and to the principle of affirmative action to ensure equal employment opportunities for women and minorities. This commitment and policy are specifically intended to mean that employment and promotion decisions are to be made and other personnel actions taken in accordance with the principles of equal employment opportunity.

The following statement from the President, dated January 1972, reaffirming this policy is prominently displayed in key locations in University buildings:

> "It is the policy of the University to recruit, hire, and promote for all job classifications, without regard to race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age, except where sex or age is a bona fide occupational qualification. To the extent that it is not inconsistent with the above, it is the University's policy (1) to intensify efforts to recruit qualified females and minority individuals at every level of responsibility, (2) to continue and to initiate special training programs to qualify such persons for beginning positions and for advancement after they join the University staff, and (3) to make the racial and sexual distribution among newly hired employees in all categories at least match, as closely as possible, the comparable distribution among qualified applicants."

B. Dissemination of Policy

The University's policy of equal employment opportunity is widely disseminated, both internally and externally. Many means of communication are used to circulate the policy as widely as possible.

Internally, the policy is clearly stated in *The Personnel Policy Manual of Columbia University* and *The Faculty Handbook*. Both publications are distributed and used throughout the University. Equal Employment "Discrimination Forbidden" posters are distributed to authorized hiring centers for posting. All union officials are informed of the policy, and nondiscrimination agreements, obligating both parties, are included in all union contracts. Memoranda from the President and the Director of Personnel, emphasizing the policy, are frequently and widely distributed.

The University policy of nondiscrimination in admissions, in the administering of financial aid to students, and in its housing facilities, is widely publicized. All School and Division bulletins state this policy.

This Program, like the University's Interim Affirmative Action Program, revised on February 29, 1972, will be printed and distributed to all parts of the University community. It will be published or abstracted in *Columbia Reports*, an official University publication that receives campus and off-campus circulation.

Another part of the internal dissemination process is the University Employment Council, formed in 1970, which coordinates the administration of the University's equal employment policy for supporting staff. Members of the Council include persons with employment responsibility for supporting staff from each major unit, the Equal Opportunity Officer, and the Director of Personnel, who serves as Chairman. The Council meets periodically to revise and coordinate means to enhance opportunities for women and for persons from minority backgrounds to be employed by the University or to move up to positions of greater responsibility, if already employed. Members of the Council include women and members of minorities in significant proportions.

Also, the University's responsibilities and commitment to affirmative action are reviewed regularly by the President with the Council of Deans.

To complete the elements of a comprehensive internal dissemination plan, the University will within six months take the following additional steps to enable its employees to know of this program and avail themselves of its benefits:

> (a) through the heads of the various units and departments, schedule special meetings with employees to discuss the program and individual employee responsibility;
>
> (b) establish a new employee orientation program for officers of administration and supporting staff that will include thorough discussion of the program; and
>
> (c) by means of periodic notices to employees (as by a pay-envelope flier), inform them of the availability of the Equal Opportunity Officer for individual consultation.

Externally, the University makes clear its policy of nondiscrimination in employment. Employment recruiting sources are notified of the policy. All help-wanted ads communicate the policy. Firms using the University's placement offices are required to signify their compliance with all Federal and State legislation prohibiting discrimination. The Equal Opportunity clause is incorporated in purchase orders, leases, and contracts. Minority and women's organizations and community agencies and leaders are notified of the University's policy. Subcontractors, vendors, and suppliers are notified of the University's policy.

All letters and other communications used in soliciting candidates for faculty positions make clear that the University is an equal opportunity employer.

C. Responsibility for Implementation of Policy

Within the University structure, the Executive Vice President for Administration has responsibility for coordinating all aspects of the Affirmative Action Program. A full-time Equal Opportunity Officer reports directly to the Executive Vice President for Administration. Together with the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, they advise the President concerning statements of policy, the identification of problem areas (including methods of reporting and audit), and methods of arriving at solutions to problems. They serve as general liaison between the University and outside parties, although much of the detailed liaison is by operating offices such as Personnel, Purchasing, Public Affairs, and Projects and Grants. The key personnel are:

Mr. Paul D. Carter
Executive Vice President for Administration
213 Low Memorial Library
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027
(212) 280-2843

Ms. Beverly C. Clark
Equal Opportunity Officer and Assistant to the
Executive Vice President for Administration
309-C Low Memorial Library
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027
(212) 280-3554

The Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost has specific responsibility for developing and implementing the Affirmative Action Program in relation to recruiting, employment, promotion, salary progression, and discontinuance of officers of instruction, of research, and of the libraries.

The Deans of Schools, Chairmen of Departments, and Directors of administrative offices are assigned responsibilities for carrying out all aspects of the Affirmative Action Program within their particular divisions of the University. These include providing periodic reports to the appropriate executive officer as to compliance with the Program.

The Director of Personnel has been charged with the development and maintenance of complete and uniform records that will permit in-depth analyses, by minority group and sex, of University employment patterns and of applicant flow, referrals, promotions, salary progressions, transfers, and terminations. The Equal Opportunity Officer, in conjunction with the Director of Personnel, has the responsibility for analyzing this and other information and reporting the results of this analysis to the appropriate senior officers to ensure the University's overall adherence to the Affirmative Action Program.

II. OFFICERS OF INSTRUCTION AND RESEARCH

A. Columbia's Profile

The University has made an internal analysis of the utilization of women and minority group members in its faculties and research positions. The purpose of this analysis was to ascertain whether deficiencies existed and, if they did, to establish goals for correcting them. Neither a deficiency nor a valid goal could be established, in turn, without a standard. The standard for determining deficiencies was "having fewer minorities or women in a particular job classification than would reasonably be expected by their availability."* From this standard arose the concept of the hiring pool, that is, a group of people who share the same job-related characteristics and skills.

Columbia has used three sets of comparative pool data for analyzing the utilization of women in its faculties. Two of these pools, the national 1970 pool and the pool of women doctorates during the decade 1960-69, are based on a national "census" of women doctorates. The third is Columbia's primary hiring pool for women, defined as those with doctorates earned at the four universities which have supplied Columbia with approximately 60% of its Arts and Sciences faculty, that is, Columbia itself, Harvard, the University of California at Berkeley, and Yale (Tables 1-3).

The use of national pools has definite limitations as a basis for measuring performance and building faculty recruitment policies. National pool statistics represent the maximum number in the pool and do not allow for the number of doctorates or equivalent degree holders who are not in the labor market and who have not chosen academic careers. They do not identify quality within any category. In some cases, national pool data reflect lower percentages of women and minority doctorates than would data of a more selective pool showing the sources on which Columbia has relied most heavily. National pool data do not, furthermore, include holders of foreign degrees and thus may fail to reflect significant sectors of the talent pool from which an international university like Columbia selects its faculty. Finally, the national pool statistics are incomplete. They are typically available only for whole disciplines and not for specialized fields. Thus, the number of women in the national pool of historians is known, but the number of women in the pool that is pertinent for a professorship in American history is not known.

Pool data, with a few exceptions, do not exist for minority groups. Scant information now at hand in the form of an unpublished 1968 memorandum, "Graduate Education and Black Americans," prepared by Fred E. Crossland for the Ford Foundation, suggests that Blacks constitute less than 1% of the national pool of doctorates. It is improbable that the proportion of Spanish-surnamed, Orientals, or American Indians is higher. In these cases there would seem to be no reliable standard for determining deficiencies except failure to exercise all reasonable efforts to recruit from among these groups.

National pool data do, however, present certain advantages as a basis for affirmative action policies. They are reliable statistics, covering 99% of the degrees annually awarded in the United States. They offer the possibility of a uniform base for the kinds of institutional analyses required by Revised Order 4 and lessen the possibility that nonuniform or arbitrary standards of compliance may be applied. National pool statistics have the further advantage of providing a way of estimating changes in the pool of women doctorates (and, potentially, that of minority doctorates) over time and permitting such adjustments of goals and recruitment policies as these changes may suggest.

The composition of Columbia's professoriate, when compared with the composition of the national pools, indicates that the University as a whole meets and indeed exceeds the standards for compliance as a federal contractor.

The percentage of women in the nation holding doctorates or equivalent degrees in all fields of instruction given at Columbia is 10%.[1] At Columbia, women constitute 17.1% of full-time faculty members and 14.4% excluding the School of Nursing. Either percentage represents a significantly higher proportion of women on the faculty than is the case at any other major university for which we have data (Table 4). Moreover, Columbia tends to appoint women to full-time faculty positions according to the levels of their availability in the various national pools. Thus, while there are few faculty women in the School of

---

*"Rules and Regulations." U.S. Department of Labor *Federal Register* (41 CFR §60-2. 11(a)).

[1]See *Summary Report 1970 Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities*. Prepared in the Manpower Studies Branch, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Research Council, Washington, D.C. OSP-MS-4, March 1971.

Business, the national pool for which comprises only 5.5% women, our utilization of women on the School of Social Work faculty, with a national pool of 47.1% women, rises very sharply to the point where, at 55.4%, it exceeds the national percentage. This same pattern holds for clusters of departments that draw women from pools of various sizes (Table 5).

The best evidence suggests that in no academic discipline does the percentage of Blacks exceed 1% in the national pool, and it is probable that the total of other minorities does not exceed 1%. At Columbia, 4.4% of the full-time faculty are Black, and 5.7% belong to other minority groups (Table 6). Among the part-time faculty, 10.1% belong to minority groups, and 19.4% of Columbia's officers of research are minority group members (Tables 7 and 8).

A similarly strong profile holds with respect to women on the part-time faculty and in full-time positions as officers of research. Columbia appoints women to these positions at a rate significantly exceeding the national pool percentages of women, and this is true for virtually every academic subunit in the University (Tables 7-9).

Average salaries of officers of instruction and officers of research as of 1971 were analyzed to identify salary differences between men and women and between minority groups and others. Among full-time officers of instruction, 57 cases were found out of a possible 111 in which there were salary differences larger than 5% among members of the identified groups holding the same rank (Tables 10 and 11). Twenty-two of these cases were discrepancies in favor of women or minority groups. Of the remaining 35, in which the difference was in favor of men or majority group members, the large majority were accounted for by differences in length of time in rank or by merit considerations. The small remaining number of differences has been corrected or will be corrected by salary adjustments in the next fiscal year (1972-73).

Columbia's nondiscriminatory salary policies are strongly evident also in part-time faculty salaries. Here, the mean salaries of men and women and minority group members approach absolute equality, with all discrepancies favoring women and minorities (Table 12). It should be noted that salaries of part-time officers of instruction are not susceptible to the kind of precise analysis that may be applied to full-time faculty salaries, primarily because part-time salaries do not consistently reflect rank, but rather tend to vary according to the proportion of the officer's time devoted to the University. A further complicating factor is that part-time salary may be an unreliable indicator of actual salary in the case of faculty members who derive portions of their salary fro[illegible]non-Columbia sources, by arrangement with other institutions. There is no reason to believe, however, that these factors differentially affect the salaries of women and men or minority and majority group members.

There are no differences in the average salaries of men and women holding the rank of research associate, who constitute fully three-fourths of the total full-time research staff of the University (Table 13). There is a difference of roughly 13% in the average salaries of men and women research officers overall. Efforts are under way specifically to locate salary differences which are not accounted for by individual differences in length of service, highest degree earned, or quality of performance or by the distribution of the minority and majority research officers in schools with different salary schedules.

The strong overall profile of the University reflects the degree to which Columbia's policies of nondiscrimination, antedating the policies embodied in Revised Order 4, have anticipated affirmative action principles and have incorporated them into the University's regular processes of faculty recruitment and development. Such discrepancies as have been found—and which require explanation and possible corrective action—are localized to a few ranks or units. Our unit-by-unit analyses suggest that there are extremely few discrepancies between the availability of women and minorities and their actual representation on Columbia faculties within the several pretenure ranks. It is only when ranks at the tenure level are analyzed that notable variations in the utilization of women are evident. It is therefore predominantly in these areas that the University intends to concentrate its efforts, not only to bring more women and members of minorities to the Columbia faculty but also to develop better knowledge about the causes of such discrepancies, which will lead to more effective methods of recruitment.

B. Goals

Institutions of higher learning are best equipped to contribute to the objectives of affirmative action by providing educational opportunities to women and minority groups, thus increasing their presence in the national pool of scholars and educators. We note in this connection that Columbia is and has long been a pacemaker in contributing to the national pool of professional and faculty women (Table 14). Columbia has awarded, in the decade 1960-69, nearly twice as many doctorates to women as the national average (22.2% at Columbia as against 12.2% in the nation). Columbia will, we believe, continue to stay well ahead of the nation in this regard.

We cannot confidently predict a similar scale of contribution over the next five years to the national pool of minority scholars and educators, because resources are lacking for the financial aid needed to encourage and sustain significantly increased numbers of minority students in graduate education. Moreover, the level of opportunity for these students is declining, as students everywhere encounter mounting financial discouragements to the pursuit of graduate education. Chief among these is the precipitate reduction in public funds to support graduate fellowships: from 1968-69 to 1972-73, the number of students supported at Columbia by public fellowships declined 40%, a decrement which will continue with the phasing out of the National Defense Education Act, Title IV fellowship program in 1972-74. To these discouragements are added rising tuition charges and increases in the personal indebtedness incurred in meeting the costs of undergraduate education.

Beginning in the 1960s, Columbia achieved substantial momentum in broadening educational access at the graduate level for the disadvantaged. The number of Black and Spanish-surnamed students receiving Ph.D. degrees from Columbia increased by 100% (13 to 27) during the sixties over the previous decade, and our graduate student enrollment for these groups has been increased by 78% (50 to 89) in the last four years. Moreover, from 1969 to 1971 Columbia furnished full fellowship support to every entering minority graduate student.

This momentum is now jeopardized. In the absence of a return to public policies supportive of graduate educational opportunity, the next five years may well see the falling off of minority applications and the deflection of a generation of potential minority scholars and educators away from the pool of national talent.

Public policies to bring graduate training within the means of the disadvantaged are urgently needed to complement policies to increase their employment on faculties. If such public policies are not developed and funded, the real goals of affirmative action will be frustrated, and the universities instead will be caught up in an escalating competition among themselves for a pool of minority scholars and teachers too small to provide the desired end result.

In the following pages, goals for faculty recruitment are stated as targets for good faith efforts over a period of five years, because Columbia operates on a basis of five-year projections, annually updated under the master-planning requirements of New York State as well as under our own planning and budgetary policies. Annual changes in the composition of faculties and professional research staff will be identified, goals will be revised accordingly, and where there is opportunity to do so, attempts will be made to accelerate progress.

Goals are expressed in terms of new appointments only, not in terms of the composition of any faculty or school. For each of the schools or faculties,* the number of new appointments has been estimated from projected terminations due to retirements, resignations, and expiration of terms of appointment, as adjusted for planned changes in faculty size. The University's goals are directly tied to the number of recruiting opportunities which result from the normal processes of faculty growth and attrition and which are possible to achieve through nondiscriminatory, nonpreferential hiring practices. Consistent with the provisions of *Higher Education Guidelines*, issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on October 1, 1972, University policy proscribes recruitment efforts limited to any sex or ethnic group as well as faculty employment decisions based upon the treatment of sexual or ethnic identification alone as a qualification.**

Possible deficiencies are identified by comparing the percentage of women (or minority members) in the nation's potential professoriate, by specialty, with the percentage in the various schools and faculties at Columbia utilizing that specialty. Where statistical discrepancies appear, the problem arises as to whether or not they are deficiencies indicative of discrimination requiring corrective action. Two possibilities exist: that the discrepancy arises primarily from a practice within the University or that it results from a cause external to the University, such as, perhaps, an occupational mobility pattern in which women leave good positions to accommodate changes in the job location of husbands or a traditional family pattern which

---

*International Affairs, Columbia College, and the School of General Studies do not have stated goals because the faculties of these schools are included as members of the Arts and Sciences departments.

**"In the area of academic appointments, a nondiscriminatory selection process does not mean that an institution should indulge in 'reverse discrimination' or 'preferential treatment' which leads to the selection of unqualified persons over qualified ones. Indeed, to take such action on grounds of race, ethnicity, sex, or religion constitutes discrimination in violation of the Executive Order." *Guidelines*, p. 8.

has impeded professional advancement. The University's goals are therefore expressed not in terms of single or fixed numbers but as a range of possible actions on new appointments resulting from recruitment policies which include active search for talent among women and minorities. One point on this range is the number of new appointments that would result if the current profile of a given school or faculty were to continue unchanged; the other point on this range is the number of new appointments that would result if appointment at the rate of availability in the national pool were accomplished.

In schools or faculties whose profiles indicate that Columbia's recruitment meets or exceeds the national pool availability rate, the University's goals range from a "low option"—appointment of women and minorities at less than Columbia's profile but still at the national pool average—to a "high option"—such appointments at Columbia's traditionally high rate of utilization of women and minorities.

In schools or faculties whose profiles suggest underutilization of women or minorities, the range of possible personnel actions similarly reflects a "low option"—appointments which maintain the current rate of utilization—and a "high option"—new appointments at the national pool rate. In these cases, where women or minorities have been attracted to Columbia at a rate less than their availability in the national pool, Columbia's stated goal is to move toward parity of utilization by employing the "high option."

Columbia undertakes these "high option" goals with the specific understanding that goals are targets for good faith effort and are not inflexible quotas the achievement or nonachievement of which within five years alone determines our compliance with the standards required of Federal contractors. National pool data provide information as to degree production. The data may considerably overstate the availability of distinguished teachers and scholars actually available for appointment, particularly in the more senior and tenured faculty ranks. If Columbia's affirmative action recruiting procedures reveal that fewer qualified applicants are in fact available than the national pool data would suggest, revision of the pool would be in order, and that in turn would affect the goals.

The numerical goals required by Executive Order 11246 which result from the application of these principles have been calculated by school or faculty. They are based on the employment profile prevailing in a school or faculty as of December 1971. Changes in the composition of any unit following that date would result, of course, in upward or downward revision of goals for that unit, depending on the increase or decrease of women and minorities on the faculty.

For the Faculty of Philosophy, comprising the departments of Art History and Archaeology, East Asian Languages and Cultures, English and Comparative Literature, French and Romance Philology, Germanic Languages, Greek and Latin, Italian, Linguistics, Middle East Languages and Cultures, Music, Philosophy, Religion, Slavic Languages, and Spanish and Portuguese, 28 tenured and 79 nontenured full-time faculty openings are projected to occur from 1972 to 1977. With a national pool of approximately 20% women and a 1971-72 full-time faculty composition of 24% women, the goal for this faculty ranges from 19 to 25 appointments of women over the next five-year period, of which three to six would be in the tenure ranks.

For the Faculty of Political Science, comprising the departments of Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Political Science, and Sociology, it is estimated that approximately 28 tenured and 41 nontenured full-time positions will be filled in the next five years, beginning with the 1972-73 academic year. With a national pool of approximately 10% women, a goal of seven new appointments of faculty women is indicated, three to tenure rank.

For the Faculty of Pure Science, comprising the departments of Astronomy, Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Geology, Mathematical Statistics, Mathematics, Physics, and Psychology, approximately 30 tenured and 42 nontenured full-time faculty openings are projected to occur. On the basis of a national pool of 10% women scientists, this faculty has a goal of seven appointments of women to full-time positions, of which as many as three may be to tenure rank.

The School of Social Work is projected to have four tenured and 32 nontenured full-time faculty openings through 1977. With a current composition of 55.4% women as against a national pool of 47.1% women, the School's goals range from 17 to 20 appointments of women in tenured and nontenured ranks of the faculty over the five-year period.

Three other large professional schools—Business, Engineering, and Law—have far smaller national pools of women, varying from 1.9% to 5.5%, on which to draw for faculty recruitment. With an aggregate of 23 tenured and 48 nontenured full-time positions opening up in the next five years, a goal of six tenured or nontenured appointments of women to these faculties is projected.

The Health Sciences Divisions have faculty profiles which equal or exceed pool percentages for women and minorities (Table 15). The goal (Table 16) for these divisions is to make 18 to 32 appointments of

women to the full-time faculty, within a total of 111 new appointments estimated to be made over the next five years. (Tenure and nontenure distinctions do not carry the same meaning in the Health Sciences as elsewhere in the University. For this reason and because ranks are in the process of redefinition in the Health Sciences, separate goals for tenure and nontenure appointments would not be meaningful.)

The remaining schools—Architecture, Arts, Journalism, and Library Service—are small in size, having a combined full-time faculty of 53. While Journalism and the Arts recruit from pools which are difficult to specify, it is projected that seven appointments of women will be made out of 35 faculty openings expected to occur through 1977.

Columbia's profile for part-time faculty and for full-time officers of research equals or exceeds the pool percentages for women and minorities. Turnover cannot be estimated for these ranks, since they are not subject to tenure nor, in the majority of cases, retirement, and because a large proportion of part-time faculty are on a continuing annual-reappointment basis. Our goal here is to continue present practices of appointing women and minority group officers at a rate which equals or exceeds pool percentages.

Goals for Blacks and other minorities cannot be calculated on the same basis as those for women because of the absence of comparable, authoritative data about their numbers in national pools. As noted earlier, the likelihood is that the proportion of Blacks and other minorities in Columbia's professoriate substantially exceeds their availability in the national pool. Our goal here can thus be stated only in terms of continuing the recruitment practices and policies which have attracted talent in this proportion from minority groups to Columbia's faculty and research staff and to make every reasonable effort to increase the national pool of minority talent. Maintenance of Columbia's current profile would indicate the appointment in the next five years of 24 full-time officers of instruction, University-wide, who are members of the specified minority groups.

C. Procedures

Columbia's affirmative action procedures are designed to achieve accountability within a system of decentralized responsibility. They are based on the recognition that faculty recruitment and development is more than a mere system of rewards: it is the process through which human resources are mobilized to fulfill a university's social responsibility both in transmitting knowledge to the next generation and in developing new knowledge, including knowledge in areas of critical social need in the basic and applied sciences. These procedures further recognize that the process of faculty recruitment and development inherently involves the application of qualitative criteria, and that the responsibility for applying these criteria rests primarily within the faculties themselves. The principle of faculty selection by faculty colleagues is not only a main aspect of academic freedom; it is a practical necessity as well, since it is peers and colleagues who can best evaluate the achievements and promise of the candidates in their fields. Furthermore, decentralized responsibility gives departments and schools the necessary flexibility to pursue faculty development policies which look beyond the individual qualifications of various candidates to the need for anticipating trends in knowledge and for mobilizing talent selectively in accordance with the program priorities of the department or school.

Columbia's procedures thus make affirmative action considerations an integral part of the regular process of faculty selection and development. Departments and schools themselves are expected to make and record efforts to identify women and minority group members in their applicant pools who would be eligible for each possible opening and to account for the disposition of the names in these pools. The Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs reviews the schools' appointment recommendations for conformity to affirmative action procedures prior to giving approval for the tendering of offers. In this review he is assisted by the University's Equal Opportunity Officer and by a Faculty Affirmative Action Advisory Committee, appointed by him from the various faculties of the University. The Equal Opportunity Officer and the Committee also assist the academic Vice President and the deans in identifying opportunities for enhanced utilization of women and minority group members and in developing the details of policy to ensure equal employment opportunity. (Affirmative action procedures, including the roles of the Equal Opportunity Officer and the Committee, are detailed in Appendix A, the current policy directive from the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.)

III. OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORTING STAFF

A. Utilization Analysis

The University's full- and part-time employees have been tabulated by numbers and percentages according to sex, race, and major occupational group (Tables 17-19).* The category "unclassified" contains a small number—approximately 1%—of the population under study whose personnel records contain anomalies of a type reflecting coding and listing errors in the preparation of data for machine processing. There is no evidence whatever that this small error had any effect on the outcome of the analysis reported here.

The most important results of the analysis of the University's utilization of personnel appear in Section C below, in which our goals are specified. Judgments regarding these deficiencies are made on the basis of multivariate analyses that take account of labor pool data, job qualifications, and job requirements and of educational achievements where considering these achievements is relevant and nondiscriminatory. The use of GED (General Educational Development) and SVP (Special Vocational Preparation) designations for job requirements as a strategic part of the Affirmative Action Program will minimize the inherently discriminatory consequences of the inappropriate application of formal educational requirements.

Clearly, many more of the better jobs in the University are held by majority males than by majority females or minority group members. Two facts may be noted in this connection. First, the employment of females and minority group members in each occupational group approximately parallels their employment in that group in the general United States population, in which women are predominant in clerical jobs and very many minority group members are in service jobs. Second, there is a relationship between the data on occupational composition, on the one hand, and the data on sex and educational achievement, on the other. These widespread social practices are thus reflected in the distribution of employees among the occupations represented in the University.

Although formal education bears only a partial relationship to job performance, it is an index to performance when interpreted intelligently. Frequently, it is also a formal requirement for employment, especially in the instructional-research area, although the University's policy calls for consideration of formal education or equivalent qualifications for only a limited number of positions. Therefore, the distribution of sex and ethnic groups in some instances may accurately reflect differences in ability to perform on the job because of valid education requirements. If discrimination is practiced and better-educated women and minority group members are not hired, the resulting differences will be reflected in differences in occupational composition. As was noted above, majority males hold a disproportionate share of the better University jobs. The following tabulations speak to that point:

% Below High School graduation	Majority	Minority
Total	4.9	30.0
Male	5.9	38.7
Female	3.6	17.6
% Bachelor degree and above		
Total	65.4	25.7
Male	75.3	25.7
Female	52.1	26.3

*For a discussion of Columbia's Job Classification System, see Appendix B.

There is no question that the majority population has completed more years of schooling than the total minority population and therefore could be expected to be in the better jobs. The relative educational levels of the two Columbia University groups reflect the differences as calculated from census data on the U.S. population (C.P.S.) for 1971, as follows:

	White	Black	Oriental	Spanish origin
% Below High School graduation	40.4	65.3	39.2	65.9
% Bachelor degree and above	12.3	4.5	20.3	4.8
Median years of schooling completed	12.3	10.1	12.3	9.3

In the occupational groups that are examined in this section, there is no evidence that educational requirements have been utilized in a discriminatory manner. The detailed statistical tabulations regarding the educational achievements of majority males and females show that:

In 7 occupations men had completed more years of schooling.
In 4 occupations women had completed more years of schooling.
In 2 occupations men and women had completed the same number of years of schooling.
In 4 occupations there were too few women for meaningful comparisons to be made.
In the 4 occupations in which women had completed more years of schooling, the differences were statistically insignificant and reflect, among other forces, the inverse relationship between years of schooling completed and age in the larger society.

A similar comparison of the majority and minority groups shows that:

In 10 occupations the majority personnel had completed more years of schooling.
In 3 occupations the minority personnel had completed a slightly greater number of years of schooling.
In 2 occupations both groups had completed the same number of years of schooling.
In 2 occupations there were too few minority personnel for meaningful comparisons to be made.

If one assumes that minority personnel are performing as well as or better than majority group members, then the University may be underutilizing the educational achievements of majority males in a very significant number of occupational groups in which minorities are proportionately represented. There is no evidence, however, that protected groups suffer as a consequence of such misuse of human resources.

B. Salary Analysis

In order to ascertain the relationship of sex and race to the occupational hierarchy, the University has ranked occupational groups by average salary and then noted percentages of female and minority personnel. When this is done for the professional category, we find the following:

	Full-time		
	Average salary	Percent females	Percent minority
Professional-Research	$13,790	22	18
Professional-Staff	12,563	40	11
Specialist-Managers	12,693	46	9
Semi-Professionals	9,920	55	21
Technicians	8,780	50	35

The "Managers" group may be ranked as follows:

Managers (excl. Policy & Specialist)

	Full-time		
	Average salary	Percent females	Percent minority
Academic Manager I	$17,950	18	6
Academic Manager II	13,500	40	19
Manager-Administrators	11,710	30	18
Clerical Administrators	9,700	76	19

Within each of these categories it is apparent that as salary goes down, the proportion of workers who are female or minority increases. This seems to hold both for full-time workers and part-time workers. The correlations are not perfect, however. On the one hand, Semi-Professionals have higher earnings than Technicians; on the other hand, a larger proportion of Semi-Professionals than of Technicians are women. While Academic Manager II pays somewhat better than Manager-Administrator, we find the larger proportion of females and minority group members in the former category than in the latter.

The negative relationships between salary and the proportion who are female or minority highlight the importance of: (1) the salary equalization program, now under way in extension of the job reclassification effort already accomplished, (2) the recruiting, placement, and job transfer policies described elsewhere in this program, (3) fulfilling the goals stipulated in section C of this part of the Program, and (4) the continuing analyses that pinpoint patterns of underutilization and which will inform subsequent reports on the University's compliance with regulations.

Again, goals have nevertheless been set; they will necessarily be adjusted when more appropriate labor market information (the 1970 census data) becomes available. In the meantime (as described in Part IV of this Program), many positive steps already have been taken regarding policies and practices applicable to Columbia's work force. One principal objective of these efforts, as part of the University's commitment to expand opportunities for female and minority personnel, has been to construct a fully functioning *internal labor market*, in which qualified and "qualifiable" people may move about and which becomes the first market the University will address.

Data have been compiled on the average salaries of Columbia's nonacademic, full- and part-time employees by occupation, sex, and ethnicity (Table 20). The data seem to reveal patterned differences among the relevant groups regarding which affirmative actions are to be taken. These differences are more readily observable in Table 21, in which salary intervals have been substituted for occupational classes.

For the total University, majority males averaged $14,790, and majority females, $9,270. Among the minorities, the males averaged $9,460 (very close to the figure for the majority females), and the females averaged $8,600. In most of the occupational classes where comparisons are possible, majority males earned more than majority females, although the differences are not completely consistent (under Academic Manager II, for example, the males earned $12,900, and the females, $13,100). The majority males also earned more than the minority males, with a few exceptions (as, for example, "Service, Protective").

Two closely related points must be considered in interpreting Tables 20 and 21. First, a considerable portion of the variance in the tabulated salaries is attributable to the fact that they are average salaries for groups of employees in given Columbia Classification Code categories that are heterogeneous in their composition. There are hierarchies within the categories which, as was indicated at the outset, were developed for purposes of utilization analysis. Second, the classification system described in Appendix B has been applied to the positions in the University as a fundamental part of Columbia's affirmative action plan. The salary component of this undertaking is still being analyzed, and the resulting detailed salary system will be applied to the classifications in the next fiscal year (1972-73).

The data in Table 21 therefore provide an oversimplified picture of the realities of salary arrangements in a specified Columbia Classification Code category. And the classification step, already taken in our Affirmative Action Program, will have the effect of changing the distributions of the employees within the rows of Table 20 and the rows and columns of Table 21. These tables are accordingly a one-dimensional and static picture of a multidimensional and dynamic phenomenon.

C. Goals

This section describes the standards employed in this Program for determining whether women and minorities are being underutilized in any job classification at the University. It also establishes immediate goals, intermediate goals (1975), and long-run goals (1977) for nonacademic personnel (officers of administration and supporting staff). It incorporates information on population and employment data on the University's labor markets, as discussed and defined below. It has not been possible, given the complexity of the computer analysis already undertaken, to consider in this Program the availability of promotable and transferable minority and female employees within the University and the degree of training which the University is reasonably able to undertake; the Program relies solely on information on population, employment, unemployment, and manpower availability. Moreover, unavailability of the 1970 census data has made it necessary to use less applicable data than would otherwise have been the case. Future refinement of this Program will exploit the opportunities provided by more disaggregated and current information.

1. Immediate Standards and Goals

The percentage figures in Schedule A on the next page are the University's *immediate standards*, based upon the available labor pool statistics for the surrounding area (Tables 22-24), for judging whether women and minority groups are being underutilized within selected occupational categories in the University; wherever underutilization appears, the figures represent *short run goals* to be achieved.

These standards are based upon the following facts:

(a) The University's labor market for all these nonacademic occupational groups includes the entire City of New York and parts of the surrounding urban and suburban areas in New York State and New Jersey (Tables 22-24).

(b) The University's studies indicate that the supplies of trained, skilled members of minority groups in the managerial, professional, technical, clerical, and craftsmen occupations are inadequate at the present time to allow the University to attempt to apply higher standards than those stated herein.

(c) The above immediate standards and goals reflect the proportions which women and minority groups comprised, within the occupational groups, in the labor market information available to the University, with two exceptions. One exception is where the proportion a group comprises among the workers in a field already equals their proportion among all workers in the entire labor market. In such cases, the latter proportion is used as the standard, on the assumption that equaling the population profile is *prima facie* evidence of a lack of discrimination. The other exception is that of the various categories of women as craftsmen, operatives, and laborers. The EEOC data are quite unusual in that, in the New York area, most of the women in these categories are in manufacturing industries in jobs for which women are quite readily found. Careful examination of the particular occupations engaged in by Columbia's craftsmen (carpenters, plumbers, electricians, machinists, stationary engineers, etc.), operatives (truck, automobile, and bus drivers and chauffeurs, helpers to craftsmen, etc.), and laborers (lower-level

Schedule A

SHORT-RUN GOALS

WOMEN AND MINORITIES
AS PERCENTAGES OF TOTALS
WITHIN OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS

Occupational Group	Women Total	Blacks Total	Blacks Women	Spanish-Surnamed Americans Total	Spanish-Surnamed Americans Women	Orientals Total	Orientals Women
Officials & Managers	14	2	1	1	*	*	*
Professionals	22	4	2	2	1	2[a]	1
Technicians	23	8	4	4	*	1	*
Office & Clerical	42[a]	9	7	4	3	*	*
Craftsmen	1	7	*	6	*	*	*
Operatives	1	17	*	11[a]	*	*	*
Laborers	1	19[a]	*	11[a]	*	*	*
Service Workers	36	19[a]	8[a]	11[a]	3	1	*

*Less than 0.5%

[a]Proportion in the total labor force

Schedule B

INTERMEDIATE GOALS

WOMEN AND MINORITIES
AS PERCENTAGES OF TOTALS
WITHIN OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS

Occupational Group	Women Total	Blacks Total	Blacks Women	Spanish-Surnamed Americans Total	Spanish-Surnamed Americans Women	Orientals Total	Orientals Women
Officials & Managers	33	4	1	2	*	1	*
Professionals	42[a]	7	4	3	1	2[a]	1[a]
Technicians	42[a]	17	8[a]	7	2	2[a]	1[a]
Office & Clerical	42[a]	19	8[a]	9	4[a]	1	1[a]
Craftsmen	2	13	*	11	*	1	*
Operatives	2	19[a]	*	11[a]	*	1	*
Laborers	2	19[a]	*	11[a]	*	*	*
Service Workers	42[a]	19[a]	8[a]	11[a]	4[a]	1	*

*Less than 0.5%

[a]Proportion in the total labor force

helpers, groundskeepers, etc.) reveals that in the New York area, women generally comprise approximately 1% of all employed persons. Accordingly, 1% rather than the EEOC figure is used as an immediate standard.

(d) There are too few American Indians in the metropolitan area to warrant any special standards or goals with respect to them, even though the EEOC data does report on them. In no case did they comprise as much as 0.5% of the employees in the specified occupational groups for New York employers.

The following qualifications must be applied to the standards and goals suggested above:

(a) They are, at best, *prima facie* evidence. Wherever the University or a particular unit within it relies more or less heavily on particular occupations within each of the groups than do all New York employers as a group, either a higher or a lower standard might appropriately be applied.

(b) In particular, these standards and goals should be applied with caution to the Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory, the Nevis Labs, the Computer Center, and the Library Services divisions of the University. Each of these University units employs a relatively narrow range of skilled managers, technicians, and craftsmen, by virtue of their highly specialized functions. In addition, Lamont-Doherty and Nevis are in somewhat isolated locations, and their labor markets include only parts of the metropolitan region.

(c) Even though the University meets the above standards in one occupational group or another, underutilization may still occur unless adequate recruitment, selection, placement, training, and promotion techniques and standards (described in Part IV) are employed, as they will be.

(d) The realization of the above goals depends on an adequate number of openings for new hires and promotions. Their realization is thus conditioned by the extension or contraction of disciplines and activities, on the one hand, and losses due to retirements, promotions, transfers, or other reasons, on the other.

2. Intermediate Standards and Goals

The percentage figures in Schedule B on the preceding page are Columbia's *intermediate goals*, to be realized within three years. The standards were selected as follows:

(a) In most cases they are double the immediate standards and goals (Schedule A). Columbia will not be satisfied with goals based on reports of government contractors and firms in interstate commerce who included only 11% Blacks and 6% Spanish-surnamed Americans among their employees, when these groups comprise 19% and 11%, respectively, of the Columbia area labor force.

(b) Wherever a doubling of the immediate standards produced a figure in excess of that which a particular group now comprises in the total labor market, that labor market percentage is used as a goal. Accordingly, no goal is set for women (total) above 42%, for Blacks (total) above 19% and Blacks (women) above 8%, for Spanish-surnamed Americans (total) above 11% and Spanish-surnamed Americans (women) above 1%. However, with respect to Officials and Managers, where the University is presently at a level of 28.4% and a level of 30% is set as a 10-year goal, the intermediate, three-year goal has been set at 33%.

Doubling of the immediate standards within three years is thought to be attainable, because the training period for nearly all workers in these categories is four years or less and for many occupations therein is two years or less. In addition, many workers with relevant experience and informal training may become adequately skilled in even shorter periods. Furthermore, Columbia's labor market area is rich in college, community college, technical institute, vocational high school, manpower training, and other programs that operate under public and private auspices and on full-time and part-time bases.

These intermediate standards are subject to the qualifications noted above, in subsection 1 (Immediate Standards and Goals) of this section (C).

3. Long-Run Goals

The figures in Schedule C, on the opposite page, may be used as long-run goals, to be realized within five years.

Most of these long-run goals are set at the prevailing labor market profile for the respective groups (Tables 22-24). As previously stated, a level of 36% in 1977 and 42% in 1982 has been set for women as Officials and Managers. Also, 4% is used as a goal for women in the craftsmen, operatives, and laborers occupations. This seems reasonable, in that it is four times the proportion which currently prevails in the New York area for Columbia-utilized occupations in these categories and twice the intermediate goal set for 1975 (see Schedule B).

Experience may reveal that one or another population group is not interested in these various occu-

Schedule C

LONG-RUN GOALS

WOMEN AND MINORITIES
AS PERCENTAGES OF TOTALS
WITHIN OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS

Occupational Group	Women Total	Blacks Total	Blacks Women	Spanish-Surnamed Americans Total	Spanish-Surnamed Americans Women	Orientals Total	Orientals Women
Officials & Managers	36	19	8	11	4	2	1
Professionals	42	19	8	11	4	2	1
Technicians	42	19	8	11	4	2	1
Office & Clerical	42	19	8	11	4	2	1
Craftsmen	4	19	1	11	*	2	*
Operatives	4	19	1	11	*	2	*
Laborers	4	19	1	11	*	2	*
Service Workers	42	19	8	11	4	2	1

*Less than 0.5%

pational opportunities in the numbers suggested by the above long-run goals. Experience may suggest more realistic goals. These long-run standards are also subject to opportunities for refinement provided by more disaggregated and current information. In particular, it is likely that Blacks and Puerto Ricans will comprise a larger proportion of the University's labor market in 1977 than they did in 1970.

4. Columbia University's Employment Profile and Specific Goals

Columbia University's present overall employment profile for all but faculty positions, and excluding Harlem Hospital, is as follows:

Schedule D

EMPLOYMENT PROFILE
EXCLUDING FACULTY POSITIONS
AND HARLEM HOSPITAL

Part I: Numbers of Employees

Occupational Group	Total Employees	Total Women	Blacks		Spanish-surnamed Americans		Orientals	
			Total	Women	Total	Women	Total	Women
Professional Managers (Policy)	32	. .	1	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .
Specialist Managers	132	61	6	2	2	2	2	2
Academic Manager I	110	20	6	2	. .	. .	1	. .
Academic Manager II	38	15	4	1	2	1	1	. .
Manager-Administrators	89	27	8	2	6	1	2	1
MANAGERS AND OFFICIALS.	401	123	25	7	10	4	6	3
PROFESSIONALS-STAFF.	282	112	5	2	5	4	19	7
Technicians	630	316	58	27	85	27	62	39
Semi-Professionals	299	165	30	18	8	2	17	10
TECHNICIANS. . . .	929	481	88	45	93	29	79	49
Clerical Administrators	398	298	45	27	23	12	7	6
Clerical I (High)	1312	1104	177	138	123	90	48	42
Clerical II (Low)	565	354	120	71	118	58	14	10
OFFICE AND CLERICAL	2275	1756	342	236	264	160	69	58

Occupational Group	Total Employees	Total Women	Blacks Total	Blacks Women	Spanish-Surnamed Americans Total	Spanish-Surnamed Americans Women	Orientals Total	Orientals Women
CRAFTSMEN.	190	1	23	. .	19	. .	2	. .
OPERATIVES	60	1	15	. .	18	. .	. .	. .
LABORERS	35	. .	6	. .	11	. .	. .	. .
Service, Protective	109	. .	56	. .	22	. .	. .	. .
Service, Other	873	309	384	173	231	23	. .	. .
SERVICE WORKERS. .	982	309	440	173	253	23	. .	. .

Part II: Percentage Distribution Within Occupational Groups

Occupational Group	Total Employees	Total Women	Blacks Total	Blacks Women	Spanish-Surnamed Americans Total	Spanish-Surnamed Americans Women	Orientals Total	Orientals Women
Professional Managers (Policy)	100.0%	. .	3.1	. .	. .	. .	. .	. .
Specialist Managers	100.0%	46.2	4.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
Academic Manager I	100.0%	18.1	5.4	1.8	. .	. .	0.9	. .
Academic Manager II	100.0%	39.4	10.5	2.6	5.2	2.6	2.6	. .
Manager-Administrator	100.0%	30.3	8.9	2.2	6.7	1.1	2.2	1.1
MANAGERS AND OFFICIALS.	100.0%	30.7	6.2	1.7	2.5	1.0	1.5	0.7
PROFESSIONALS-STAFF.	100.0%	39.7	1.7	0.7	1.7	1.4	6.7	2.4
Technicians	100.0%	50.1	9.2	4.2	13.4	4.2	9.8	6.1
Semi-Professionals	100.0%	55.1	10.0	6.0	2.6	0.6	5.0	3.3
TECHNICIANS. . . .	100.0%	51.8	9.5	4.8	10.0	3.1	8.5	5.3

Occupational Group	Total Employees	Total Women	Blacks		Spanish-surnamed Americans		Orientals	
			Total	Women	Total	Women	Total	Women
Clerical Administrators	100.0%	74.8	11.3	6.7	5.7	3.0	1.7	1.5
Clerical I (High)	100.0%	84.1	13.5	10.5	9.3	6.8	3.6	3.2
Clerical II (Low)	100.0%	62.6	21.0	12.5	20.8	10.2	2.4	1.7
OFFICE AND CLERICAL	100.0%	77.2	15.0	10.4	11.6	7.0	3.0	2.5
CRAFTSMEN.	100.0%	0.5	12.1	. .	10.0	. .	1.0	. .
OPERATIVES	100.0%	1.6	25.0	. .	30.0	. .	. .	. .
LABORERS	100.0%	. .	17.1	. .	31.4	. .	. .	. .
Service, Protective	100.0%	. .	51.3	. .	20.1	. .	. .	. .
Service, Other	100.0%	35.3	43.9	19.8	26.4	2.6	. .	. .
SERVICE WORKERS.	100.0%	31.5	44.8	17.6	25.8	2.3	. .	. .

With respect to immediate goals, Columbia already exceeds the immediate standards stipulated in Schedule A in all cases but one. The exception is Orientals employed as service workers. The University should seek to employ perhaps five Orientals as service workers, of whom one might be a woman. In addition, the lack of women and members of minority groups in various subcategories among managers and the protective service occupations suggests a more detailed examination to see whether added goals should be stipulated in those occupational groups.

With respect to intermediate goals, again Columbia already exceeds, in most cases, the goals set forth in Schedule B above. The exceptions and the appropriate goals are as follows:

Occupational Group	To be added between 1972 and 1975
Professionals-Staff	15 Blacks, total 11 Blacks, women 3 Spanish-surnamed, men
Technicians and Semi-Professionals	70 Blacks, total 29 Blacks, women
Office and Clerical	90 Blacks, men
Craftsmen	3 women, total 1 woman, minority
Operatives	1 Oriental, total
Laborers	1 woman, total
Service Workers	103 women, total 16 women, Spanish-surnamed 2 women, Orientals 10 Orientals, total

With respect to long-run goals (Schedule C), Columbia needs to remedy apparent deficiencies as follows:

Occupational Group	To be added between 1972 and 1977
Managers and Officials	51 Blacks, total 25 Blacks, women 34 Spanish-surnamed, total 12 Spanish-surnamed, women
Professionals-Staff	49 Blacks, total 21 Blacks, women 26 Spanish-surnamed, total 7 Spanish-surnamed, women
Technicians and Semi-Professionals	89 Blacks, total 29 Blacks, women 8 Spanish-surnamed, women
Clerical and Office	144 Blacks, men 55 Spanish-surnamed, men

Occupational Group	To be added between 1972 and 1977
Craftsmen	7 women, total 2 women, minority
Operatives	1 woman, total 1 Oriental, total
Laborers	1 woman, total 1 Oriental, total
Service Workers	103 women, total 16 women, Spanish-surnamed 10 women, Orientals 19 Orientals, total

By 1982, Columbia should have employed or developed additional officials and managers in the various population groups as follows:

Women, total	45
Blacks, total	51
Blacks, women	25
Spanish-surnamed Americans, total	34
Spanish-surnamed, women	12

IV. PROCEDURES AND PROGRAMS

A. Procedures and Policies

1. Annual Audits

Beginning in 1972, and each year thereafter, the University's employee population on September 30 will be compared with that of the previous year in terms of frequency distributions by sex and race within appropriately grouped position classifications and units of analysis. Changes, if any, in the available "talent pools" also will be examined.

September 30 has been selected as the date of the annual audit for several reasons. Since the University's new academic calendar year begins September 1, the employee population should be filled by the 30th. The data generated will provide the basis for the annual update of the University's Affirmative Action Program, which will occur at approximately the end of each calendar year. Finally, the September 30 picture of employment patterns will be available in time to influence budgetary and faculty-hiring decisions for the next fiscal year and academic year.

The September 30 data will be analyzed by the Personnel Office and the Equal Opportunity Officer. The analyses will describe progress or lack of progress in achieving goals on University-wide and appropriate units bases. The goals reflected elsewhere (Parts II and III) in this Program will be "incremental": the annual audit will identify possible deficiencies by comparing the percentage of women (or minority members) in the appropriate "talent pool" available on the audit date with the corresponding "employment profile" of both academic and nonacademic employees in the various appropriate employment units of the University on the audit date. The results of these analyses will be reported to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Executive Vice President for Administration. The results of the annual analyses, appropriately aggregated, will be publicly disclosed to the University community.

Where the data shows unsatisfactory progress in affirmative action, the two executive vice presidents, following consultations with the appropriate deans and unit directors, will meet with the President's Faculty and Administrative Advisory committees to examine possible causes. Procedures for eliminating these causes and plans for corrective action, where appropriate, will be included in the update of the Affirmative Action Program and will be instituted in the appropriate divisions and units.

2. Recruiting and Hiring

(a) Recruiting sources

Recruiting of academic personnel has been discussed in Part III. For nonacademic personnel, the University now uses and will continue to use employment agencies and media outlets that are specifically directed toward female and minority populations. The units for which analysis reveals an underutilization of minorities or women will be specifically informed by the Personnel Office of the necessity to intensify their use of such special sources.

(b) Employment applications

The University's standard employment application form has been reviewed to assure that no questions are asked which are inadvertently discriminatory. Each application carries the notice that New York State, New York City, and Federal laws prohibit discrimination in employment because of age, sex, race, color, religion, or national origin.

(c) Testing

Twelve preemployment or prepromotion tests are currently administered by individual employing units or by the Central Personnel Office and its satellite employment offices. Included are tests in typing, shorthand, keypunch, bookkeeping, arithmetic, handwriting, proofreading, card filing, current affairs, language proficiency, and basic electronics.

Only the typing and shorthand tests are administered at the Central Personnel Office. These are standardized tests that are given under controlled and uniform conditions. They are administered only with respect to jobs that require the skills in question. Varying standards of qualification are used for typing (50 words per minute for secretarial, 25 words per minute for "light typing"). Very few job requests still carry a shorthand requirement, and applicants who do not pass the test are given the opportunity of immediate retesting using the same test letter. As a result, failure of the shorthand test is rare.

Information currently available indicates that all testing done outside the Central Personnel Office is "content valid" within the meaning of applicable OFCC regulations. The language-proficiency tests, for example, are administered only for library positions beyond the entry level requiring review and indexing of foreign language materials. Nevertheless, a directive has been sent to all units requiring them to submit sample tests (or descriptions thereof), establish their content validity, and furnish test results. This information will then be submitted for valuation by testing experts. Any test found not to be content valid

will be disregarded as a basis for future personnel actions until or unless it can be properly validated. A progress report on testing will be included in the annual update of the University's Affirmative Action Program.

(d) Applicant flow

Following the President's instructions of November 11, 1971, the Personnel Office issued employee requisition forms to all hiring centers in the University. Applicant data including sex and ethnic identification as well as source and disposition information are recorded on these forms, which are returned to the central office for tabulation and summary. In this way, the University can maintain an up-to-date profile of its applicant flow.

3. Promotion

The establishment of central control of noninstructional employment through the Personnel Office and authorized satellite employment offices has permitted the institution of a posting procedure for promotional opportunities. Listings of job openings are mailed to every unit in the University. Positions are held open for internal applicants through the Friday following the day of posting.

The weekly distribution in list form is an interim procedural step. Following announcement of the formal position classification plan (see Appendix C), promotional openings will be posted separately on receipt of a requisition in the Personnel Office. This will allow for full description of the open position together with the minimum requirements as well as the wage rate or salary range.

4. Validation of Position Classifications

Position classifications for all administrative and supporting staff positions are near completion. During the month of April 1972, each unit manager (vice president, dean, director, department chairman) will be notified on the grading of the personnel in his or her jurisdiction. Following notification, a period of about one month will be allowed for the managers to appeal the grading decisions. This appeal will be in writing to the Director of Personnel. For positions in Grades I through VII, the Director of Personnel, following review by his Wage and Salary Section, will confirm or adjust the initial grading. This action will be binding. For positions in Grade VIII and above, the written appeal of a grading decision will be referred by the Director of Personnel to the Senior Salary and Classification Review Committee. The review of the Committee will be binding.

At the conclusion of the period during which unit managers may appeal for adjustments in the new classifications, each employee will be notified of the grade of his or her position. In the event of dissatisfaction with the grading, the employee may, after discussion with the unit manager, individually appeal the classification of the position to the Director of Personnel. This appeal must be in writing and can be made either with or without the endorsement of the unit manager. An employee classification appeal will be treated in the same manner as an appeal by the unit manager. All decisions on employee appeals will be communicated to the employee in writing by the Director of Personnel.

Opportunity for appeal of a classification is not restricted to the period immediately following the announcement of classification. An appeal may be submitted by a unit manager or by an employee after consultation with the manager at any time that a change of duties may indicate the need for a classification review.

5. Employee Evaluation

A plan for establishing a formal, periodic evaluation of employee performance is being developed by the Personnel Office and a subcommittee of the Advisory Committee to the President for affirmative action in the noninstructional sector. A standard format for evaluation will supplant any now in use in any division of the University and will be administered by the Central Personnel Office. Budgetary provision for the staffing and expense of this program has been given to the Personnel Office for 1972-73. A performance review will be required at the conclusion of the probationary period and annually thereafter on the anniversary of the date of employment. The evaluation in each case will be discussed with and signed by the employee. The target for announcement and implementation of this program is September 1, 1972.

6. Grievance Procedures

Grievance procedures have been developed for officers of administration, research, and the Libraries and for the nonunion supporting staff.* Grievance procedures for instructional staff are contained in the Code of Academic Freedom and Tenure in Chapter IV, "Grievance Procedures," and Chapter VI,

---

*See Appendix C.

"Dismissal Procedures." In addition, grievance procedures are detailed in the University's union agreements.

7. Maternity Leave

The uniform policy for officers of instruction, administration, and research and union and nonunion supporting staff set forth below will remain in effect pending the renegotiation of union contracts and the formulation of a specific policy for instructional staff.

1. Any employee with at least six-months' service who is pregnant shall be eligible for unpaid maternity leave.
2. The commencement date of the maternity leave shall be left to the discretion of the individual except that (a) after the sixth month of pregnancy, the University reserves the right to require an authorization from the employee's physician and (b) for reasons of health or safety of the employee, the employee may be required to commence such leave, on certification of a physician, prior to the sixth month of pregnancy.
3. Such leave shall not exceed nine (9) months in duration, except that employees exposed to radiation who are required to take maternity leave prior to the sixth month of pregnancy will be granted leave for a period of twelve (12) months, and except that, if for a valid reason, nine (9) months should prove an insufficient time to permit the employee to return to active status, the employee may request an extension of the leave and such request will be accorded reasonable consideration.
4. No employee shall be discharged by reason of pregnancy or direct medical results thereof while on maternity leave. Each employee, upon return to active status, shall be reemployed in the same position or in a position of equivalent rank and salary.

8. Nepotism

Employment opportunities are offered to spouses and other relatives on a competitive basis. The University policy states a negative preference in cases where the job is under the immediate supervision of a spouse or close relative. Even in these cases, however, no prohibition is expressed, and a number of instances can be cited where close relatives work in the same University department.

9. Purchasing

All purchase orders carry Equal Employment Opportunity clauses. In addition, the University maintains a separate unit of the Purchasing Office in Harlem to insure that minority suppliers have the opportunity to bid for University orders in a timely fashion.

10. Contractors and Subcontractors

All contractors and subcontractors will be notified of the provisions required by section 202 of Executive Order No. 11246, as amended. The equal opportunity clause will appear in all contracts and subcontracts in excess of $10,000.

11. Fringe Benefits

Fringe benefit plans, including retirement and hospitalization plans and pension rights, have been reviewed to assure that there are no provisions of any University benefit plan which are inadvertently discriminatory.

B. University Programs Supportive of Equal Opportunity

The University maintains a number of programs, some of which are outlined below, designed to provide equal opportunities for upgrading or job advancement to employees and others, to increase the number of qualified women and minorities in national pools, or to enhance working conditions for employees who have family obligations.

1. The Columbia University Employee Training Program

Since October 1968, a unit of the Personnel Office has offered courses for the development and upgrading of office and basic general skills. Each year there have been over 500 registrants from among supporting staff employees. Approximately 75% of the registrants in the program are members of minorities, and 70% are women. The program started with clerically oriented courses that included

English Grammar, Business English, Typing, Gregg Shorthand, Bookkeeping, and General Mathematics. Courses that have been added include Reading Comprehension, English Composition, Algebra, Conversational Spanish, and General Accounting. These courses are scheduled between the hours of four and six o'clock in the evening. Employees receive released time in order to attend them (the normal workday ends at five o'clock). There is no fee, but texts must be purchased by the registrant.

2. Technical Skill Development Program

(a) Instruction in Computer Operation is offered to employees of the University at elementary and advanced levels. Computer Operation courses are given to employees of the Computer Center by the Center's technical staff as a form of on-the-job training for upgrading. Courses in programming also are offered through the Center as part of the University's academic offering. The introductory courses are open to any University employee, without charge, and are offered in day and night classes so that released time is not necessary.

(b) The Department of Buildings and Grounds conducts courses in Basic Electricity, Air-conditioning and Refrigeration Engineering, and Welding. The Engineering course, of nine-months' duration, is designed to help successful participants acquire the required license. The Department also conducts classes in specialized housekeeping techniques. All of these courses offer employees opportunities for increased technical knowledge and have been successful in opening the way for advancement. At the present time, 84 employees, 36 of whom are members of minorities, are enrolled in these programs.

3. Tuition Exemption

Nonprofessional employees may apply to attend, tuition free, a schedule of undergraduate courses in the University's School of General Studies which may lead to a bachelor's degree or which may be taken apart from the formal degree programs. Employees who already hold the bachelor's degree may apply for admission to one of the University's programs of graduate or professional studies. In the Spring Term 1971, enrollment under the tuition exemption program totaled 774 men and 631 women. Of the men, 553 were officers, and 191 were supporting staff; of the women, 186 were officers, and 445 were supporting staff. Racial figures are not available.

4. Instruction in English

The American Language Program of the School of General Studies offers instruction to non-English-speaking members of the staff and to those whose communication skills in English need improvement. The courses are offered free throughout the academic year and in the summer under the University's program of tuition exemption.

5. Regular Term Instructional Programs

(a) Harlem Regional Stroke Program

The Harlem Regional Stroke Program, which is available to Harlem area residents, operates under the auspices of the Columbia University-Harlem Hospital Affiliation. After a training period, the participants may enroll in college programs leading to the Associate in Arts degree in an allied health field. Continued support is available to enable those who qualify to continue toward the degree of Bachelor of Arts, again, in an allied health field. Participants are paid a salary as health service workers while they continue as students in the program. University faculty and administrators have successfully negotiated, over the years, with other outside funding agencies for support of training programs in the allied medical fields, including dentistry.

(b) Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP)

Operating with funds from the New York State Education Department and the Ford Foundation, this program enables the undergraduate divisions of the University as well as Barnard College (an affiliated but separate institution) to recruit greater numbers of minority students and, through remedial work and counseling activities, to increase their opportunity to complete degree programs. The program is coordinated on a University-wide basis, and supporting services are specially tailored for economically and educationally disavantaged students at the undergraduate level (with the prospect of follow-through efforts to continue at the graduate and professional school levels). Current registration figures are available in totals; 149 students are registered, mostly members of minorities.

(c) Premedical Opportunity Program

In an effort to train more Black physicians, the School of General Studies has developed this program to train minority college graduates for entrance into medical schools, including Columbia's College of Physicians and Surgeons. The effort is being carried out in cooperation with the Manhattan Central

Medical Society, an association of Black physicians, which is helping to recruit and screen candidates for the program. Students in the program are supported by funds made available by the Urban Center at Columbia and several foundations. Five students are currently enrolled, of whom all are minority group members and three are women.

(d) Council for Opportunity in Graduate Management Education (COGME)

Based at the Graduate School of Business and supported by a grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the Council seeks to increase minority group members' awareness of master's programs as the professional link between undergraduate experience and careers in management. The Council is an organization of limited life through which Columbia and a consortium of other institutions will cooperate in substantially increasing the enrollment of minority students in graduate management programs over the next five years. In 1970-71, 27 persons participated; all were minority group members, and four were women. In 1971-72, 50 persons are participating; all are minority group members, and five are women.

(e) Library Intern Program

The Libraries have developed an intern program designed to bring additional members of minority groups into the library profession. Initially, four or five people will be brought into the program. They will work part time in the Libraries, attending the School of Library Service on a half-time basis. The interns will receive junior-level professional appointments, and their courses at the School of Library Service will be exempt from tuition. An in-service training program for the interns will further identify them as a distinctive group within the Libraries, not simply part-time staff members attending library school.

6. Summer Instructional Programs

(a) Project Double Discovery

Project Double Discovery has been operated since 1965 on the Morningside Campus by Columbia College. Eight weeks of intensive instruction and participation in cultural activities in New York City are made available annually to approximately 300 New York City students from deprived backgrounds. The intent of the program is to give the student a better chance of gaining admission to college. Counseling and follow-up continue throughout the academic year after completion of the summer session.

(b) Summer Training Program for College Teachers

Under a grant from the United States Office of Education, Division of College Support, Columbia University sponsors a Summer Training Program for College Teachers. Last summer, 45 teachers (36 minority group members) from developing colleges in the South attended the University for six- or 12-week periods for study in the fields of anthropology, history, Black studies, mathematics, chemistry, and physics. Fifteen of them were women. Participants received graduate or undergraduate credit for the courses they took and received living and dependency stipends.

(c) Visiting Faculty Program

Under a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the University last summer provided additional training to eight minority teachers from developing colleges in the South. The Visiting Faculty Program is a supplementary part of the Summer Training Program for College Teachers. Participants, who are granted living stipends and dependency awards and attend the University for a six-week period, receive six points of graduate credit.

(d) Puerto Rican Institute in History and Culture

Assisted by a grant from the New York State Department of Education, Columbia University sponsored an institute in Puerto Rican history and culture. The program was designed to accommodate 40 State secondary-school teachers and supervisory personnel—teachers and supervisors whose major responsibility is in curriculum coordination and development in the social studies or whose teaching responsibilities are concerned with the formulation and teaching of special or regular courses in Puerto Rican Studies or Urban Studies. Forty-four minority teachers and supervisory personnel, 25 of whom were women, attended this instutute last summer. Continued operation in the summer of 1972 will depend upon refunding by the New York State Office of Education.

(e) Afro-American Lecture Series

A grant from the New York State Office of Education assisted the University in establishing an afternoon lecture, film, and discussion series in the area of Black Studies. The series is ofered two afternoons a week for six weeks and is available to New York State secondary-school teachers and administrators who participated in the Afro-American Institutes of 1969 and 1970. The program is also open to the participants in the Summer Training Program for College Teachers and the Visiting Faculty Program.

(f) Program in the Physical and Life Sciences

Since 1969, the University has sponsored an eight-week program in the physical and life sciences for secondary-school students. Supported by a grant from the Sloan Foundation and additional funds from

the Rockefeller Foundation and the Urban Center, the program provides training for students from disadvantaged areas with undeveloped potential, interest, and motivation in the sciences. In an effort to improve the preparation of these students for college-level study in science, participants are required to take a course in mathematics and one in either physics, chemistry, or biology. Recreational and educational field trips, laboratory sessions, and opportunities for individual research are included. Fifty-one students were enrolled last summer, of whom 41 were minority group members and 27 were women.

(g) Training Program for Minority Journalists

The Graduate School of Journalism conducts an intensive 10-week training program for minority group members who are either in journalism or are entering journalism for the first time. Courses are offered both in Broadcast and Print Journalism. The students are recruited nationally and are totally supported by grants from the Ford Foundation, the New York Urban Coalition, and the Standard Oil Company (New Jersey). All graduates of the program have been placed in journalism jobs.

In addition to the specific programs described herein, a large number of courses in Ethnic and Urban Studies are among the regular academic offerings of the University.

7. Day Care Centers

In order to facilitate employment of women and minority group members in the University and local community, the University has assigned a member of the instructional staff of the School of Social Work to make recommendations for the development of a comprehensive policy of child care. Two pilot programs are already in operation in two new University buildings, one at 125th Street near the Morningside Heights campus and the other in Washington Heights near the Medical Center. These programs will be evaluated periodically and expanded, if successful, to permit the participation of all University personnel and community residents.

8. Nursery Schools

The University contributes to the operation of three nursery schools in the Morningside area and one in the Washington Heights (Medical Center) area which are open to students and employees of the University. The nursery schools provide post-day care educational opportunities for children of University-affiliated parents on a reduced-cost basis—"reduced cost" relative to nursery school costs in the metropolitan area and, in the case of one of the nursery schools, relative to tuition charges for children of nonaffiliated parents.

APPENDICES
AND
TABLES

A NOTE ON THE TABLES

Columbia salaries and employment as of December 31, 1971 provide the data base for the following tables reflecting Columbia's instructional, administrative, research, and supporting staff profiles. No changes in employment or salaries following that date have been incorporated. Annual updating of profiles and goals is stipulated in Columbia's Affirmative Action Program, and as of this date (December 15, 1972) such updating is in progress, using Columbia salaries and employment prevailing as of September 30, 1972.

APPENDIX A

MEMORANDUM

November 27, 1972

FROM: Wm. Theodore de Bary, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

TO: The Deans and the Vice President for Information Services

SUBJECT: Affirmative Action Procedures for Officers of Instruction and Officers of the Libraries

I. Clearance of Offers of Appointment

The University's Affirmative Action Program, now formally accepted by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, provides that with the exception of certain graduate student ranks, no offer of appointment as an officer of instruction or as an officer of the Libraries may be tendered without the prior approval of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. The offers of appointment included in this requirement are as follows:

1. all offers to persons outside the University, whether for full- or part-time appointments, including visiting, adjunct, and Summer Session appointments;

2. all offers to persons within the University for first appointments as full-time or tenured officers of instruction or of the Libraries.

Contingent offers of appointment in the above cases may not be extended in advance of my letter of clearance written to the dean concerned. When a school or department or the Libraries find it necessary to inform a proposed appointee that it intends to recommend his or her appointment to the University, the candidate should be informed also that no offer can be made by the University until the proposed appointment has been reviewed by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; and that the purpose of the review is to ascertain that the school or department has followed the procedural requirements of the University's Affirmative Action Program, and has properly determined that the candidate should be appointed in comparison with the other candidates considered.

Specific guidelines on clearance and on communications to prospective appointees will be provided to department chairmen in the health sciences, in Arts and Sciences, and in Engineering respectively by the Deans of the Faculty of Medicine, of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, and of the School of Engineering and Applied Science.

Budget officers are instructed to execute appointment forms only after the necessary clearance of a proposed offer has been given.

II. Documentation

The availability of documentation to establish that nondiscriminatory procedures have been followed, and positive steps have been taken to include qualified women and minority group members in academic recruitment efforts, is necessary for approval of proposed offers of appointment. The required documentation consists of the following:

1. *Statement of standard search and evaluation procedures.* A general statement describing the standard procedures followed by the school or department in identifying and evaluating candidates for appointment should be filed with my office. This statement need accompany only the first request of a school or department for clearance made during an academic year. If the procedures followed in any subsequent selection of a candidate differ from those described in the general statement, those differences should be noted in the documentation ac-

companying the subsequent request for clearance. This general statement should indicate school or department practice concerning the use and selection of search committees, how the school or department makes position openings known, whether seminar or class appearances and student reports are used to evaluate candidates, and the manner in which the department or school decides upon particular candidates, as, for example, by vote of the whole faculty or department.

2. *Search report.* A brief report of the specific search for the candidate for whom clearance is requested should accompany each clearance request. This report, subject to the exception noted in paragraph (3) below, should identify the institutions and professional groups canvassed, the relevant professional files or registries utilized, and the names and institutional affiliations of the individuals consulted, including women and minority professionals in the discipline. The search report should also identify the media communication utilized in making the position opening known.

Enclosure 1 contains a current listing of women's and minority caucuses within the professional associations which may be useful in meeting requirements for active search for qualified women and minority group members.

Records must be kept of correspondence, advertisements or postings, and notes of oral communications, including telephone conversations, pertaining to searches.

3. *Special statement concerning internal recruitment without external search.* It is general University practice that first appointments as tenured and other full-time officers of instruction are preceded by an external search for candidates, whether or not the nominee eventually selected is already at the University. There may be certain ranks or positions, however, which are filled by internal recruitment in the absence of an external search. Examples of such exceptions are first appointments to officer rank of persons who have participated in internal training programs in the Libraries.

The dean of any school in which such exceptions are permitted should file with my office a statement of school policy specifying the following:

> a. the ranks for which, or the circumstances under which, nominees for first appointment as tenured or other full-time officers of instruction may be selected in the absence of an external search:
>
> b. the procedures required for evaluating candidates so selected (e.g., systematic comparison with peers in the same field outside the University);
>
> c. the criteria which are applied in judging the qualifications of the candidate(s).

This statement should be filed with my office in advance of any specific requests for clearance of a proposed offer of appointment.

4. *A completed "Confidential Applicant Pool Report"* of all applications received and all candidates considered for the appointment. (Enclosure 2)

5. *A completed "Confidential Report of Most Qualified Candidates."* (Enclosure 3)

III. Requests for clearance

Requests for clearance, accompanied by the documentation described in (II) above, are made to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs by the deans (or in the case of librarians, by the University Librarian), not by the department chairmen. In the health sciences, requests and documentation from department chairmen are submitted to the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, for his review and recommendation to me. Department chairmen in the Arts and Sciences and in the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences submit their requests and documentation to the Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of Engineering, respectively, for their transmittal to me. I then notify the appropriate dean of the action taken.

In the case of proposed offers of appointment to tenure rank, the dean's request for clearance of an offer should be made no later than his request for the convening of an *ad hoc* review committee, and no *ad hoc* review may occur prior to the granting of such clearance.

To expedite the procedure in cases where the availability of the first preferred candidate is uncertain, clearance may be requested for a ranked list of two or three preferred candidates rather than a single candidate. Such a request is, however, subject to the documentation requirements specified in (II).

Except in those cases where they may make offers of appointment as officers of instruction, the Deans of Columbia College, of the School of International Affairs, and of the School of General Studies do not make requests for clearance of offers of appointment.

IV. Emergency appointments

"Emergency" appointments arising either from unanticipated late vacancies or unpredictable last-minute enrollment changes which preclude a full search conforming to Affirmative Action guidelines nevertheless require prior clearance. Clearance of offers of appointment under these conditions is contingent upon (1) an essential curricular need which cannot be met except by emergency appointment, (2) an identification of the pool from which the proposed appointee was drawn, even if a wholly intra-University pool, (3) assurance that the proposed appointee will be informed that the appointment is interim and not considered renewable without a complete search in accordance with the University's Affirmative Action Program.

Requests meeting these requirements should be made by letter to me. My office is prepared to expedite action on requests for clearance of offers of emergency appointment, and deans may consult by telephoning extension 2821.

V. Prohibition of preferential hiring

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare's *Higher Education Guidelines*, published October 1, 1972, provides that

> In the area of academic appointments, a nondiscriminatory selection process does not mean that an institution should indulge in "reverse discrimination" or "preferential treatment" which leads to the selection of unqualified persons over qualified ones. Indeed, to take such action on grounds of race, ethnicity, sex or religion constitutes discrimination in violation of the Executive Order. (Page 8)

> It should be noted that a contractor is required to make explicit its commitment to equal employment opportunity in all recruiting announcements or advertisements. It may do this by indicating that it is an "equal opportunity employer." It is a violation of the Executive Order, however, for a prospective employer to state that only members of a particular minority group or sex will be considered. (Page 6)

In no case should preference for candidates of a particular sex or ethnic identification be stated or implied in connection with any search. All written matter used in the search should make explicit Columbia's commitment to equal employment opportunity by indicating that Columbia is "an equal opportunity employer."

VI. Reappointments

Reappointments of officers of instruction to the same or comparable rank (e.g., continuing appointments of assistant professors or of part-time officers of instruction) do not require central clearance under the Affirmative Action Program. An offer of reappointment to an officer of instruction initially appointed as an "emergency" appointee (Section IV above) is, however, excepted, and requires central clearance meeting the documentation requirements for new appointments (Section II).

VII. Promotions and salary increases

Promotions and salary increases will receive budgetary approval only if nondiscriminatory procedures

have been followed in awarding them. Promotions and salary increases will be reviewed for this purpose as part of my annual review of proposed school budgets prior to their submission to the Trustees. Salary analyses showing median salaries by rank, sex, and minority affiliation are made annually, and individual increases are reviewed in the context of these analyses.

VIII. Faculty Affirmative Action Advisory Committee

In reviewing supporting documentation and requests for clearance of offers of appointment I am assisted by the University's Equal Opportunity Officer and by a Faculty Affirmative Action Advisory Committee appointed by me from among the members of the various faculties in the University. Where documentation is unclear, this committee may request additional information from the dean, either in writing or through conference, which may include, at the dean's discretion, a department chairman. Subject only to the deletion of candidates' names in order to preserve their anonymity, the Committee's review covers all the documentation presented to me in connection with the request for Affirmative Action clearance.

The Committee does not review the qualifications of any candidate. It may, however, request that a school or department state the criteria and procedures it uses in determining qualifications.

APPENDIX B

JOB CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

A Wage and Salary Task Force under the direction of the Personnel Department reviewed job descriptions and evaluated the responsibilities of all personnel in the University except (i) positions under the categories of Officers of Instruction and Research, which are covered in Part II; (ii) positions in the University's libraries, because some of the library personnel are organized into a collective bargaining unit with grades and salaries stipulated in the union agreement; and (iii) those parts of the supporting staffs in maintenance and office activities which are covered in union agreements and are therefore not susceptible to the kind of analysis described below.

The Wage and Salary Task Force assigned job titles and grades on the basis of data provided (a) by the incumbents of positions among supporting office staffs, administrative officers, supporting research staff groups, and nonunion maintenance support staff groups; (b) by the immediate supervisors of these personnel; and (c) by the deans, directors, and department chairmen in charge of the activities in which these positions occur. Classifications were assigned to positions independent of the positions' incumbents; codes were matched to individuals for the purpose of this program only after the attributes of the position had been classified. The gradings were accordingly free of discriminatory elements insofar as they were assigned without knowledge of the actual salary, race, or sex of incumbents.

The classification effort yielded a list of 910 job titles, many of which represent the same basic activities in different University divisions. With the use of these job titles, the University's profile was developed by the following method:

First, each position was assigned a three-digit census code, using the 1970 census list containing the most "disaggregated" census classification. In the absence of detailed 1970 census data on occupational, sex, and racial distributions, the standards for comparisons had to be based essentially on EEOC data. While "professionals" are omitted from the base data generated by EEOC, and while slightly different classifications are utilized, the resulting margin of error is not subversive of our analysis, because the bulk of Columbia University's "professionals" appear in its academic ranks (covered in Part II), to which other comparative standards, including data bearing on the awarding of degrees, are acceptable. In its ongoing affirmative action program, the University will be able to make use of 1970 census data, when they become available, in order better to determine how the University's utilization profiles compare with the several markets from which the University's nonacademic personnel are drawn.

Second, each position was assigned a "score" on each of two scales used in the description of job trait requirements by the U.S. Employment Service in connection with the *Directory of Occupational Titles*. The use of these two scales, called General Educational Development (GED) and Special Vocational Preparation (SVP), permits the 910 job titles to be aggregated into fewer basic nonacademic titles in the University's personnel system, while preserving within the aggregations a method of differentiating jobs in a nondiscriminatory way.

The Bureau of the Census and the Department of Labor have collaborated, using the GED-SVP scales, in an effort to develop an articulation of the aggregated classifications of jobs employed by the Bureau of the Census with the more discrete classifications reported in the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*. The joint effort of these two Federal agencies is thus guided by the same approach that underlies this section of the Program.

The Columbia Classification Code is designed to show the relationships between functional groups of positions, with the intent of improving the University's capacity to assure equal opportunities in its employment practices and manage its operations more effectively. The use of the GED-SVP desginations is of specific value in this connection, for it enables us to avoid illegitimate, discriminatory uses of formal educational requirements in constructing job descriptions, a strategy that goes to the heart of one of the most serious sources of difficulty in personnel administration.

APPENDIX C

APPEAL PROCEDURE FOR APPOINTED OFFICERS (NONINSTRUCTION)

A. Covers: Officers of Administration, Officers of Research, and Officers of the Libraries, on appointment from the President or Secretary of the University.

Excludes: Officers on Trustee Appointment and Officers on term appointment at the time of the expiration of the appointment.

B. Grievable Issues:

1. Disciplinary actions and discharges for cause where the validity or appropriateness of the cause is in question.

2. Application of announced personnel policy and/or procedure in individual cases where violation, misinterpretation, or discrimination is charged.

Not Grievable:

1. A preliminary warning which could lead to an action (suspension or discharge) covered in B.1. above.

2. Terminations related to reductions in force where due notice or severence pay is provided under the policy of March 1, 1971.

3. The content of published personnel policy and procedure.

4. Decisions on position classification, salary adjustment, and promotion (which may be appealed through the Director of Personnel to the Salary and Classification Review Committee).

C. Steps in the Formal Appeal Procedure (The grievant may choose to be represented at any step by a regular member of the University Faculty or Staff):

1. The aggrieved Officer shall first discuss his or her complaint with the immediate supervisor. The supervisor is expected to render a decision on the complaint within three (3) working days.

2. If there is no resolution of the grievance at Step 1, and if the immediate supervisor is other than a Dean or Department or Division Head, the aggrieved Officer can, within five working days, next present his or her complaint orally at that level. The Dean or Department or Division Head is expected to render a decision within three (3) working days.

3. If there is no resolution of the problem at Step 1 or 2, the aggrieved Officer can, within five (5) working days of the receipt of the decision at Step 2, write to the Director of Personnel requesting a formal hearing. This request should clearly specify the basis of the complaint. During a period of five (5) working days following the receipt of this request, the Director of Personnel will attempt to mediate a solution. If the complaint involves a charge of discrimination, the Equal Opportunity Officer will be consulted by the Director of Personnel.

4. If there is no resolution of the problem at Step 3, a fact-finding committee of three will be established to hear the grievance. All members of this committee will be Officers of the University. One will be selected by the Director of Personnel after consultation with the

appropriate Dean or Department or Division Head (see Step 2). One will be selected by the grievant. The third, who will serve as Committee Chairman, will be selected by the first two from a standing panel of seven. This panel, composed of appointed Officers of the University, is annually appointed by the President on nomination by the Executive Committee of the University Senate. In the event of no agreement by the first two, the Chairman will be designated by the Chairman of the executive Committee of the University Senate, again from the standing panel of seven.

The fact-finding committee should normally be constituted within ten (10) working days of the receipt by the Director of Personnel of the written grievance. The committee will then make every effort to complete its investigation and submit its report within ten (10) working days following its appointment.

5. The report of the fact-finding committee will be directed to the Executive Vice President for Administration in cases involving Oficers of Administration and the the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs in cases involving Officers of the Libraries and Research. The appropriate Vice President will then reach a final and binding decision which will be communicated in writing to the grievant and the appropriate department head within five (5) working days of the receipt of the report of the fact-finding committee.

D. Conduct of Hearing

1. Attendance at metings of the fact-finding committee is limited to persons determined by the committee to have direct connection with the appeal.

2. In carrying out its investigation, the committee will have available to it relevant records and can call appropriate witnesses.

Table 1

THREE POOLS OF WOMEN DOCTORATES: NATIONAL 1970; NATIONAL 1960-69; COLUMBIA'S PRIMARY HIRING POOL

Arts and Sciences Departments	Per Cent Female Doctorates: United States[1] 1970	United States[2] 1960-1969	Columbia's Primary Hiring Pool[3] 1958-1967
Faculty of Political Science	12.3 (3428)	10.8 (15,683)	12.7 (2233)
Anthropology[4]	28.0 (225)	21.4 (942)	24.1 (203)
Economics	6.0 (971)	5.6 (3898)	6.9 (607)
Geography[5]	---	5.6 (663)	---
History	13.2 (1092)	11.7 (4943)	14.0 (709)
Political Science[6]	9.9 (634)	8.8 (2876)	9.7 (462)
Sociology	18.3 (506)	17.1 (2361)	19.0 (252)
Faculty of Philosophy	26.2 (2779)	20.0 (17,536)	21.4 (2221)
English & Comp. Literature	30.6 (1093)	24.1 (6322)	22.0 (722)
Foreign Languages other than Greek and Latin[7]	32.5 (784)	28.5 (4158)	30.2 (638)
Greek and Latin	30.2 (86)	25.3 (506)	19.3 (119)
Linguistics[8]	---	24.1 (551)	---
Music (& Fine Arts)[9]	29.9 (254)	13.5 (1473)	29.9 (164)
Philosophy	13.1 (350)	11.0 (1701)	12.0 (301)
Religion	4.7 (212)	5.0 (2825)	5.4 (277)
Art History[10]	---	---	---
Faculty of Pure Science	11.8 (10,652)	10.2 (57,104)	13.2 (4409)
Astronomy[11]	2.7 (1657)	6.7 (421)	3.4 (959)
Physics		2.0 (8415)	
Biological Sciences[12]	1. 15.0 2. 18.1 3. 4.2 4. 15.8 15.7 (3162)	13.8 (17,708)	21.2 (1127)
Chemistry	8.1 (2223)	6.8 (12,963)	8.8 (841)
Geology	3.1 (509)	2.5 (2143)	2.8 (319)
Mathematical Statistics[13]	6.2 (1218)	6.8 (781)	---
Mathematics		6.5 (5538)	6.2 (464)
Psychology[14]	23.5 (1883)	20.2 (9135)	28.0 (699)

(Notes on Next Page)

NOTES ON TABLE 1

1. Source: See *Summary Report 1970 Doctorate Recipients From United States Universities*. Prepared in the Manpower Studies Branch, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Research Council, Washington, D.C. OSP-MS-4, March 1971.

2. Source: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, *Earned Degrees Conferred: Bachelor's and Higher Degrees*. A publication of the Bureau of Educational Research and Development and the National Center for Educational Statistics, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

3. The data for Columbia University; the University of California, Berkeley, and Yale University were obtained from *Report on Doctoral Programs: Summary Data by Institution and Academic Field for Sixty-Seven United States Universities 1958-1967*. Prepared in the Education and Employment Section, Manpower Studies Division, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Research Council, OSP-MS-1, December 1968. The data for Harvard University include statistics for the academic year 1968-69. They were obtained from the *Dean's Report, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences*, Harvard University. We have decided to merge all four of the universities and present the data as a single set of figures even though the Harvard data are for a different time span than the data for the other three universities. Since there has been a slight increase in the proportion of female doctorates since 1967, the figures may represent a slightly higher proportion of female doctorates than was in fact the case during the 1958-67 period.

4. The data for the United States in 1970 includes a grouping of both Anthropology and Archaeology.

5. Data for doctorates in Geography were not available for the United States in 1970 (i.e., they were not part of the published documents of the NRC report). Data on Geography also were not available for the four principal "feeder" universities for the 1958-67 period.

6. For 1970, the data on Political Science includes doctorates received in International Relations.

7. The following languages were included in this grouping of foreign languages: East Asian Languages and Cultures, French and Romance Philology, Germanic Languages, Italian, Middle East Languages and Cultures, Slavic Languages, Spanish and Portuguese.

8. The data for 1970 United States and for the four "feeder" institutions were not available in published sources.

9. The 1970 data groups Music and Fine Arts together; the data for 1960-69 includes data for Music, Sacred Music only. During this same period there were 18.2 % female doctorates awarded in "Art General" and 30.3% female doctorates awarded in "Fine and Applied Arts, All other (fine arts) fields." Therefore, the sharp difference between the figures for 1970 and 1960-69 can, in part, be explained by the two different definitions of inclusion in this table.

10. Data for "Art History" were unavailable from the published sources.

11. The National Research Council presents the data for Astronomy and Physics together.

12. The National Research Council's 1970 Report presents four groups of specialties in the biological sciences: 1) Biochemistry, Biophysics, Physiology, Molecular Biology; 2) Anatomy, Cytology, Entomology, Genetics, Microbiology, Embryology; 3) Ecology, Hydrobiology; 4) Botany, Zoology, General Biology. In this table we have presented the percentage of female doctorates awarded in each of these four specialty groups and have presented the weighted average of all four groups. The figures for 1960-69 include doctorates in all biological specialties.

13. No separate data were available for 1970 or for the "feeder" universities for Mathematical Statistics. Some departments list these doctorates with Economics, others with Mathematics.

14. The data presented in this table include all psychology specialties grouped together. The percentages of female doctorates in the various specialties range from 19.3% in "General Psychology" to 27.0% in "Educational Psychology" (1964-69, only).

Table 2

SCHOOLS: POOL DATA
1960-69

Schools	% Women	% Minorities
Architecture[1]	7.6	n.d.*
Business[2]	5.5	n.d.
Engineering[3]	1.9	n.d.
Law[4]	4.2	n.d.
Library Service[5]	26.9	n.d.
Social Work[6]	47.1	n.d.
School of the Arts[7]	n.d.	n.d.
School of Journalism[8]	n.d.	n.d.

*n.d. = no national pool data available.

(For Health Sciences Division see Table 3)

NOTES

1-6. For detailed computations on the bases used in constructing these pool data, see Appendix.

7-8. National pool data which were appropriate to the hiring practices of these two schools are not currently available. For discussion see text.

n.d. = no national pool data available.

Table 3

HEALTH SCIENCES DIVISION:
POOL DATA FOR WOMEN AND MINORITIES

Division	Estimated Pool: Percent Women	Minority	Pool Notes
Dental and Oral Surgery	8.5	2.6	1
School of Public Health	9.1	2.2	2
School of Nursing	98.0	2.6	3
Medicine - Clinical Sciences	9.6	2.2	4
Medicine - Basic Sciences	11.4	0.44	5
Research Institutes	10.2	1.6	6
Harlem Hospital Center	9.6	2.2	7
Grand Totals	14.3	2.0	8

NOTES

Sources of Pool Estimates

1. ADA 1960-1970 Survey of Dentists and AAMC data on Dental Hygiene Faculties.
2. AAMC, ibid NMA.
3. ANA 1971 Statistical Summary & AAMC, ibid.
4. AAMC, ibid & NMA.
5. AAMC, ibid & American Society of Biological Scientists.
6. Combined index of Basic and Clinical Sciences per employed ratios from 4 and 5 above.
7. AAMC & NMA.
8. Weighted index per employed ratios & AAMC general statistics.

Table 4

A COMPARISON OF THE PROPORTION
OF FEMALE TO TOTAL FACULTY MEMBERS
AT COLUMBIA AND FOUR MAJOR UNIVERSITIES

University	Percent Female
Columbia:[1]	
Arts and Sciences Depts.	11.3 (552)
All Schools of the University[2]	17.1 (1471)
All Schools Excluding School of Nursing	14.4 (1425)
Harvard,[3] Chicago,[3] Berkeley,[4] Pennsylvania[5]	8.8 (5086)

NOTES

1. All full-time instructional staff as of December 1971 are included in this table. Students who teach are not included in these data.

2. These data include all professional schools and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

3. From Report of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University, 1970-1971; Chicago, spring 1969.

4. From Report of the Subcommittee on the Status of Academic Women on the Berkeley Campus.

5. From Report of the Committee on the Status of Women, established by the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Council.

Table 5

THE PROPORTION OF WOMEN
IN FULL-TIME FACULTY POSITIONS
IN RELATION TO PROPORTION IN HIRING POOL

	% Women in full-time faculty positions
Arts and Sciences: Departments with hiring pool	
0-9% women Ph.D.'s	1.7 (173)
10-19% women Ph.D.'s	5.5 (131)
20+% women Ph.D.'s	21.8 (248)
Professional Schools:[1]	
0-9% women (Arch., Business, Law, Engineering, Health Sciences excluding Nursing)	12.4 (684)
20+% women[2] (Library Services, Nursing, Social Work)	68.3 (123)

NOTES

1. The Schools of Journalism and the Arts were not included in these tables since we do not have adequate pool data for them.

2. There were no schools with a hiring pool from 10 to 19% women. The three schools with pools of women in excess of 20% actually have pools greatly in excess of 20%.

Table 6

COLUMBIA PROFILE
FULL-TIME FACULTY

	Columbia		National Pool of Doctorates or Equivalent, 1960-69
	%	No.	
Women — Total Faculty	17.1	252 (1471)	10.0%[1] (122,491)
Women — Excluding Nursing	14.4	206 (1425)	
Black	4.4	65	est. < 1.0%[2]
Other minorities	5.7	84	No data
Total minorities	10.1[3]	149	

NOTES

1. Excludes doctorates in Agriculture, Education, Folklore, Forestry, Home Economics, and Trade and Industrial Training, for which Columbia does not have departments.

2. Fred E. Crossland, "Graduate Education and Black Americans," Ford Foundation, 1968 (unpublished mimeo).

3. Includes 2.9% of the 10.1% minorities, who are also included in the % women.

Table 7

COLUMBIA PROFILE
PART-TIME FACULTY[1]

	Columbia		National Pool of Doctorates or Equivalent, 1960-69
	%	No.	
A. Excluding Harlem Hospital			
Women	14.9	95 (639)	10.0%
Minorities	6.7	43[2] (639)	No data
B. Including Harlem Hospital			
Women	14.0	101 (719)	10.0%
Minorities	10.7	77[3] (719)	No data

No sex or ethnic code available: 39

NOTES

1. Excludes unsalaried officers and student teaching ranks.
2. Includes 1.7% (11) women, also counted in % women.
3. Includes 2.1% (15) women, also counted in % women.

Table 8

COLUMBIA PROFILE
FULL-TIME OFFICERS OF RESEARCH[1]

	Columbia		National Pool of Doctorates or Equivalent, 1960-69[2]
	%	No.	
Women	21.7	65 (299)	9.05%
Minorities	19.4	583 (299)	No data

NOTES

1. Harlem Hospital excluded.
2. See Table 9 for construction of pool.
3. Includes 4.3% (13) women, also counted in % women.

Table 9

PROFILE OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
FULL-TIME OFFICERS OF RESEARCH
BY RANK, SEX & ETHNICITY
(EXCLUDING HARLEM HOSPITAL)

Research Rank	Total			Majority			Minority		
	Staff	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Senior Staff Associate	100.0%	83.3	16.7	94.4%	77.8	16.7	5.6%	5.6	---
	(18)	(15)	(3)	(17)	(14)	(3)	(1)	(1)	---
Senior Research Associate	100.0	83.9	16.1	87.1	71.0	16.1	12.9	12.9	---
	(31)	(26)	(5)	(27)	(22)	(5)	(4)	(4)	---
Staff Associate	100.0	100.0	---	92.6	92.6	---	7.4	7.4	---
	(27)	(27)	---	(25)	(25)	---	(2)	(2)	---
Research Associate	100.0	74.4	25.6	77.1	57.4	19.7	22.9	17.0	5.8
	(223)	(166)	(57)	(172)	(128)	(44)	(51)	(38)	(13)
Total	100.0%	78.3	21.7	80.6%	63.2	17.4	19.4%	15.0	4.3
	(299)	(234)	(65)	(241)	(189)	(52)	(58)	(45)	(13)

No sex or ethnic code available for thirteen persons.

Table 10

Average Salary - Full-Time Faculty
(Under $1,000 ANNUAL salary excluded)

		SEX		
		MEN	WOMEN	
	PROFESSORS			
ETHNICITY	WHITE	$ 23,843	$ 22,740	
	BLACK	22,458	NONE	
	ORIENTAL	23,833	23,000	
	SPANISH	18,625	NONE	
				(N=541)
	ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS			
ETHNICITY	WHITE	18,348	17,580	
	BLACK	24,417	15,000	
	ORIENTAL	16,843	14,625	
	SPANISH	15,250	15,625	
				(N=253)
	ASSISTANT PROFESSORS			
ETHNICITY	WHITE	14,752	14,611	
	BLACK	21,899	14,060	
	ORIENTAL	13,361	19,000	
	SPANISH	16,950	11,688	
				(N=407)
	INSTRUCTOR			
ETHNICITY	WHITE	12,209	11,603	
	BLACK	18,315	17,884	
	ORIENTAL	13,350	16,320	
	SPANISH	8,375	9,000	
				(N=96)
	ASSOCIATE			
ETHNICITY	WHITE	13,320	11,185	
	BLACK	20,097	14,660	
	ORIENTAL	16,500	9,940	
	SPANISH	12,000	NONE	
				(N=114)
	LECTURER			
ETHNICITY	WHITE	11,527	10,392	
	BLACK	NONE	NONE	
	ORIENTAL	7,750	8,000	
	SPANISH	9,500	NONE	
				(N=43)
	CLINICAL PROFESSOR			
ETHNICITY	WHITE	32,083	NONE	
	BLACK	37,767	39,750	
				(N=7)
	ASSOCIATE CLINICAL PROFESSOR			
ETHNICITY	WHITE	34,135	37,955	
	BLACK	37,052	30,000	
				(N=8)

Table 11

FULL-TIME FACULTY
ANALYSIS OF SALARY DIFFERENCES EXCEEDING 5%

	Total # of Comparisons[1]	No Difference	Women <Men	Women >Men	Minorities[2] <Majority	Minorities >Majority
Arts and Sciences						
#	52	25	9	4	8	6
%	100	48.1	17.3	7.7	15.4	11.5
Professional Schools Other than Health Sciences						
#	22	15	3	1	3	0
%	100	68.2	13.6	4.5	13.6	---
Health Sciences Divisions						
#	37	14	9	4	3	7
%	100	37.8	24.3	10.8	8.1	18.9
Total University Comparison						
#	111	54	21	9	14	13
%	100	48.6	18.9	8.1	12.6	11.7

NOTES

1. These are comparisons of mean salaries within groups. Thus, if there are two female assistant professors in a department and they are compared to the male assistant professors in that department, this constituted one comparison although it involved more than two individuals.

2. Discrepancies between female minority instructors are tabulated under women.

Table 12

MEAN SALARIES FOR PART-TIME OFFICERS OF INSTRUCTION
EXCLUDING HARLEM HOSPITAL
December 1971

	Total			Majority			Minority		
	Staff	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Mean Salary	$ 5232	5188	5481	5364	5327	5581	5805	5760	5939
Number	514	437	77	448	383	65	36	27	9
%	100.0	85.0	15.0	87.2	74.5	12.6	7.0	5.3	1.8

No sex or ethnic code available: 30 (5.8%)

Table 13

MEAN SALARIES OF FULL-TIME OFFICERS OF RESEARCH[1]
EXCLUDING HARLEM HOSPITAL
December 1971

	Total			Majority			Minority		
	Staff	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Research Associate	$ 12543 (223)	$ 12557 (166)	$ 12507 (57)	$ 13004 (172)	$ 13062 (128)	$ 12853 (44)	$ 11260 (51)	$ 11233 (38)	$ 11338 (13)
Total	13712 (299)	13928 (234)	12920 (65)	14206 (241)	14462 (189)	13316 (52)	11934 (58)	12106 (45)	11338 (13)

Sex and ethnic data not available for 13 cases.

NOTES

1. Data are presented only for the research associate rank and for the total full-time research staff. There are only a limited number of cases within the senior research ranks, and a breakdown into multiple sex and ethnic categories will reveal salary information for individual cases. Since the research associate classification accounts for 75 per cent of the total research staff, the data for this large group do not reveal individual salaries and, thus, are presented separately.

Table 14

PH.D.'s GRANTED TO WOMEN

	Per Cent Female PH.D.'s			
	U.S. Total 1960-69	Columbia 1960-69	Columbia 1950-59	Columbia 1940-49
Faculty of Political Science	10.8 (15,683)	17.0 (1034)	12.1 (779)	18.6 (345)
Anthropology	21.4 (942)	35.7 (98)	28.6 (98)	18.8 (32)
Economics	5.6 (3898)	12.8 (235)	6.2 (194)	17.7 (96)
Geography	5.6 (663)	9.1 (22)	-- (6)	-- (4)
History	11.7 (4943)	15.3 (353)	9.6 (290)	21.9 (160)
Political Science	8.8 (2876)	12.1 (198)	9.6 (73)	6.2 (16)
Sociology	17.1 (2361)	25.0 (128)	16.1 (118)	13.5 (37)
Faculty of Philosophy	20.0 (17,536)	28.6 (1031)	18.7 (788)	27.3 (319)
English & Comp. Lit.	24.1 (6322)	25.0 (421)	17.8 (253)	34.3 (199)
Modern Foreign Langs.	28.5 (4158)	43.8 (236)	28.4 (246)	34.4 (4)
Greek and Latin	25.3 (506)	36.6 (41)	19.0 (21)	10.0 (10)
Linguistics	24.1 (551)	21.4 (28)	21.4 (14)	-- (2)
Music & Fine Arts	13.5 (1473)	34.8 (23)	14.3 (7)	-- (3)
Philosophy	11.0 (1701)	15.0 (120)	9.6 (125)	12.1 (66)
Religion	5.0 (2825)	8.9 (90)	4.9 (102)	-- (15)
Art History	--	44.4 (72)	35.0 (20)	-- (3)
Faculty of Pure Science	10.2 (57,104)	21.3 (1264)	11.8 (976)	21.8 (573)
Astronomy	6.7 (421)	12.5 (8)	-- (2)	-- (4)
Physics	2.0 (8415)	5.8 (243)	2.8 (180)	2.2 (45)
Biological Sciences	13.8 (17,708)	36.4 (192)	25.4 (165)	39.4 (109)
Chemistry	6.8 (12,963)	14.6 (199)	9.2 (229)	15.6 (231)
Geology (Earth Sciences)	2.5 (2143)	4.9 (142)	1.4 (144)	10.2 (49)
Mathematical Statistics	6.8 (781)	ND	ND	ND
Mathematics	6.5 (5538)	6.7 (119)	1.8 (55)	6.4 (31)
Psychology	20.2 (9135)	38.8 (361)	21.4 (201)	33.3 (111)

Source:

1. Columbia Data file of Office of Scientific Personnel, N.A.S.-N.R.C.
2. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Earned Degrees Conferred; Bachelor's and Higher Degrees. A publication of the Bureau of Educational Research and Development and the National Center for Educational Statistics, Washington D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office.

***

Table 15

HEALTH SCIENCES DIVISION
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS TO POOL DATA (OFFICERS)

	Actual 12/31/71 (1)					Estimated Pool (1)		Pool Notes (see below)
	Total	Female		Minority		Female	Minority	
	#	#	%	#	%	%	%	
Administration/Service								
Full-Time	15	7	46.7	2	13.3	8.5	2.6	)
Part-Time	5	0	0	0	0	8.5	2.6	) 2
Unpaid	0	0	0	0	0	8.5	2.6	)
Total	20	7	35.0	2	10.0	8.5	2.6	)
Dental and Oral Surgery								
Full-Time	40	8	20.0	2	5.0	9.1	2.2	)
Part-Time	64	4	6.2	1	1.6	9.1	2.2	) 3
Unpaid	169	7	4.1	5	3.0	9.1	2.2	)
Total	273	19	7.0	8	2.9	9.1	2.2	)
School of Public Health								
Full-Time	72	32	44.4	17	23.6	14.6	2.5	)
Part-Time	17	5	29.4	2	11.8	14.6	2.5	) 4
Unpaid	156	21	13.5	13	8.3	14.6	2.5	)
Total	245	58	23.7	32	13.1	14.6	2.5	)
School of Nursing								
Full-Time	52	51	98.1	5	9.6	98.0	2.6	)
Part-Time	5	3	60.0	0	0	98.0	2.6	) 5
Unpaid	13	12	92.3	2	15.4	98.0	2.6	)
Total	70	66	94.3	7	10.0	98.0	2.6	)
Medicine - Clinical Sciences								
Full-Time	364	88	24.2	13	3.6	9.6	2.2	)
Part-Time	182	28	15.4	9	4.9	9.6	2.2	) 6
Unpaid	875	114	13.0	21	2.4	9.6	2.2	)
Total	1421	230	16.2	43	3.0	9.6	2.2	)
Medicine - Basic Sciences								
Full-Time	109	21	19.3	2	1.8	11.4	0.44	)
Part-Time	5	4	80.0	0	0	11.4	0.44	) 7
Unpaid	31	5	16.1	0	0	11.4	0.44	)
Total	145	30	20.7	2	1.4	11.4	0.44	)
Research Institutes								
Full-Time	57	19	33.3	3	5.3	10.2	1.6	)
Part-Time	6	2	33.3	1	16.7	10.2	1.6	) 8
Unpaid	2	0	0	0	0	10.2	1.6	)
Total	65	21	32.3	4	6.2	10.2	1.6	)
Harlem Hospital Center								
Full-Time	98	37	37.8	60	61.2	9.6	2.2	)
Part-Time	58	3	5.2	23	39.7	9.6	2.2	) 9
Unpaid	0	0	0	0	0	9.6	2.2	)
Total	156	40	25.6	83	53.2	9.6	2.2	)
Grand Totals								
Full-Time	807	263	32.6	104	12.9	14.3	2.0	)
Part-Time	342	49	14.3	36	10.5	14.3	2.0	) 10
Unpaid	1246	159	12.8	41	3.3	14.3	2.0	)
Total	2395	471	19.7	181	7.6	14.3	2.0	)

NOTES

1. Minority data includes Blacks and Spanish-surnamed Americans only. No comparative estimates for pools for Orientals. Oriental hiring should be maintained at existing percentage - see utilization analysis (no under-representation indicated).

Sources of Pool Data Estimates:

2. AAMC general statistics from Division of Operational Services for females; general data from NMA for minorities.
3. ADA 1960-1970 Survey of Dentists and AAMC data on Dental Hygiene Faculties.
4. AAMC, ibid & NMA
5. ANA 1971 Statistical Summary & AAMC, ibid.
6. AAMC, ibid & NMA.
7. AAMC, ibid & American Society of Biological Scientists.
8. Combined Index of Basic and Clinical Sciences per employed ratio from 6 and 7 above.
9. Same as 6.
10. Weighted index per employed ratios & AAMC general statistics.

Table 16

HEALTH SCIENCES DIVISION
GOALS FOR SALARIED OFFICER POSITIONS
1972-77

	A Estimated Turnover	B Growth	C Estimated New Hires	D* Pools % Women	D* Pools % Min.	E Goal Range Women	E Goal Range Min.	F Goal Range Women	F Goal Range Min.
Administration/Service									
Full-Time	2	-	2	8.5	2.6	0	0	1	0
Part-Time	0	-	0	8.5	2.6	0	0	0	0
Total	2	-	2	8.5	2.6	0	0	1	0
Dental and Oral Surgery									
Full-Time	6	-	6	9.1	2.2	1	0	1	0
Part-Time	7	-	7	9.1	2.2	1	0	0	0
Total	13	-	13	9.1	2.2	2	0	1	0
Public Health									
Full-Time	8	-	8	14.6	2.5	1	0	3	2
Part-Time	2	-	2	14.6	2.5	0	0	1	0
Total	10	-	10	14.6	2.5	1	0	4	2
Nursing									
Full-Time	7	-	7	98.0	2.6	7	0	6	1
Part-Time	1	-	1	98.0	2.6	1	0	1	0
Total	8	-	8	98.0	2.6	8	0	7	1
School of Medicine Clinical Sciences									
Full-Time	55	-	55	9.6	2.2	5	1	13	5
Part-Time	26	-	26	9.6	2.2	2	1	4	1
Total	81	-	81	9.6	2.2	7	2	17	6
Basic Sciences									
Full-Time	17	-	17	11.4	0.44	2	0	3	1
Part-Time	0	-	0	11.4	0.44	0	0	0	0
Total	17	-	17	11.4	0.44	2	0	3	1
Research Institutes									
Full-Time	7	-	7	10.2	1.6	1	0	2	1
Part-Time	0	-	0	10.2	1.6	0	0	0	0
Total	7	-	7	10.2	1.6	1	0	2	1
Harlem Hospital									
Full-Time	9	-	9	9.6	2.2	1	0	3	6
Part-Time	6	-	6	9.6	2.2	1	0	0	2
Total	15	-	15	9.6	2.2	2	0	3	8
Grand Total									
Full-Time	111	-	111	14.3	2.0	18	2	32	16
Part-Time	42	-	42	14.3	2.0	5	1	6	3
Total	153	-	153	14.3	2.0	23	3	38	19

*Pool Data provided by AAMC, American Association of Biological Scientists, American Dental Association, National Medical Association, U.S. Public Health Service Manpower Studies. Minority Pool Data includes estimates for Blacks and Spanish-surnamed Americans only.

Table 17

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NUMBERS OF EMPLOYEES BY OCCUPATION, SEX AND ETHNICITY (TOTAL)
(EXCLUDING HARLEM HOSPITAL)
Revised April 28, 1972

	Total			Majority			Minority			Sex Ethnicity NA	Black			Oriental			Spanish		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female		Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Professional Managers (Policy)	32	31	-	31	30	-	1	1	-	1	1	1							
Specialist Managers	132	71	61	119	65	54	11	5	6	2	6	4	2	2	-	2	2	-	2
Professionals-Instruction	2196	1823	369	1955	1636	317	188	142	46	55	64	48	16	81	60	21	31	22	9
Professionals-Research	377	292	83	299	228	69	66	52	14	14	5	4	1	40	31	9	7	6	1
Professionals-Staff	282	169	112	246	147	98	30	17	13	7	5	3	2	19	12	7	5	1	4
Technicians	630	314	316	414	196	218	214	118	96	2	58	31	27	62	23	39	85	58	27
Semi-Professionals	299	132	165	237	103	134	58	27	31	4	30	12	18	17	7	10	8	6	2
Academic Manager I	110	89	20	102	84	18	7	5	2	1	6	4	2	1	1	-	-	-	-
Academic Manager II	38	23	15	30	17	13	7	5	2	1	4	3	1	1	1	-	2	1	1
Manager-Administrators	89	62	27	71	49	22	16	12	4	2	8	6	2	2	1	1	6	5	1
Clerical Administrators	398	100	298	316	67	249	78	33	45	4	45	18	27	7	1	6	23	11	12
Clerical I (high)	1312	206	1104	945	123	821	360	82	277	9	177	39	138	48	6	42	123	33	90
Clerical II (low)	565	211	354	308	98	210	254	112	142	3	120	48	71	14	4	10	118	60	58
Craftsmen	190	189	1	135	134	1	44	44	-	11	23	23	-	2	2	-	19	19	-
Operatives	60	59	1	26	25	1	33	33	-	1	15	15	-	-	-	-	18	18	-
Service, Protective	109	109	-	30	30	-	78	78	-	1	56	56	-	-	-	-	22	22	-
Service, Other	873	562	309	249	136	112	618	420	197	8	384	211	173	-	-	-	231	207	23
Laborers	35	35	-	17	17	-	17	17	-	1	6	6	-	-	-	-	11	11	-
Unclassified	126	30	40	55	24	31	30	6	9	56	22	3	6	2	-	2	4	2	1
Total	7853	4507	3275	5585	3209	2368	2110	1209	884	183	1035	535	486	298	149	149	715	482	231

NA = Not Available

Table 18

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
PERCENTAGE OF EMPLOYEES BY OCCUPATION, SEX AND ETHNICITY (ROWS)
(EXCLUDING HARLEM HOSPITAL)
Revised April 28, 1972

	Total			Majority			Minority			Sex Ethnicity NA	Black			Oriental			Spanish			Sex Ethnicity NA
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female		Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	
Professional Managers (Policy)	100.0	96.8	-	96.8	93.7	-	3.1	3.1	-	3.1	3.1	3.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Specialist Managers	100.0	53.7	46.2	90.1	49.2	40.9	8.3	3.7	4.5	1.5	4.5	3.0	1.5	1.5	-	1.5	1.5	-	1.5	.7
Professionals-Instruction	100.0	83.0	16.8	89.0	74.4	14.4	8.5	6.4	2.0	2.5	2.9	2.1	.7	3.6	2.7	.9	1.4	1.0	.4	.5
Professionals-Research	100.0	77.4	22.0	79.3	60.4	18.3	17.5	13.7	3.7	3.7	1.3	1.0	.3	10.6	8.2	2.8	1.8	1.5	.2	3.7
Professionals-Staff	100.0	59.9	39.7	87.2	52.1	34.7	10.6	6.0	4.6	2.4	1.7	1.0	.7	6.7	4.2	2.4	1.7	.3	1.4	.3
Technicians	100.0	49.8	50.1	65.7	31.1	34.6	33.9	18.7	15.2	.3	9.2	4.9	4.2	9.8	3.6	6.1	13.4	9.2	4.2	1.4
Semi-Professionals	100.0	44.1	55.1	79.2	34.4	44.8	19.3	9.0	10.3	1.3	10.0	4.3	6.0	5.0	2.3	3.3	2.6	2.0	.6	1.0
Academic Manager I	100.0	80.9	18.1	92.7	76.3	16.3	6.3	4.5	1.8	.9	5.4	3.6	1.8	.9	.9	-	-	-	-	-
Academic Manager II	100.0	60.5	39.4	78.9	44.7	34.2	18.4	13.1	5.2	2.6	10.5	7.8	2.6	2.6	2.6	-	5.2	2.6	2.6	-
Manager-Administrators	100.0	69.6	30.3	79.7	55.7	24.7	17.9	13.4	4.4	2.2	8.9	6.7	2.2	2.2	1.1	1.1	6.7	5.6	1.1	-
Clerical Administrators	100.0	25.1	74.8	79.3	16.8	62.5	19.5	8.2	11.3	1.0	11.3	4.5	6.7	1.7	.2	1.5	5.7	2.7	3.0	.7
Clerical I (high)	100.0	15.7	84.1	72.0	9.3	62.5	27.4	6.2	21.1	.6	13.5	2.9	10.5	3.6	.4	3.2	9.3	2.5	6.8	.9
Clerical II (low)	100.0	37.3	62.6	54.5	17.3	37.1	44.9	19.8	25.1	.5	21.0	8.4	12.5	2.4	.7	1.7	20.8	10.6	10.2	.5
Craftsmen	100.0	99.4	.5	71.0	70.5	.5	23.1	23.1	-	5.7	12.1	12.1	-	1.0	1.0	-	10.0	10.0	-	-
Operatives	100.0	98.3	1.6	43.3	41.6	1.6	55.0	55.0	-	1.6	25.0	25.0	-	-	-	-	30.0	30.0	-	-
Service,Protective	100.0	100.	-	27.5	27.5	-	71.5	71.5	-	.9	51.3	51.3	-	-	-	-	20.1	20.1	-	-
Service, Other	100.0	64.3	35.3	28.5	15.5	12.8	70.7	48.1	22.5	.9	43.9	24.1	19.8	-	-	-	26.4	23.7	2.6	.4
Laborers	100.0	100.	-	48.5	48.5	-	48.5	48.5	-	2.8	17.1	17.1	-	-	-	-	31.4	31.4	-	-
Unclassified	100.0	23.8	31.7	43.6	19.0	24.6	23.8	4.7	7.1	44.4	17.4	2.3	4.7	1.5	-	1.5	3.1	1.5	.7	12.6
Total	100.0	57.3	41.7	71.1	40.8	30.1	26.8	15.3	11.2	2.3	13.1	6.8	6.1	3.7	1.8	1.8	9.1	6.1	2.9	.9

NA = Not Available

Table 19

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
PERCENTAGE OF EMPLOYEES BY OCCUPATION, SEX AND ETHNICITY (COLUMNS)
(EXCLUDING HARLEM HOSPITAL)
Revised April 28, 1972

	Total			Majority			Minority			Sex Ethnicity NA	Black			Oriental			Spanish		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female		Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Professional Managers (Policy)	0.4	0.7	-	0.6	0.9	-	0.05	0.1	-	0.5	.1	.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Specialist Managers	1.7	1.6	1.9	2.1	2.0	2.3	0.5	0.4	0.7	1.1	.6	.7	.4	.7	-	1.3	.3	-	.9
Professionals-instruction	28.0	40.4	11.3	35.0	51.1	13.4	8.9	11.7	5.2	30.1	6.2	9.0	3.3	27.2	40.3	14.1	4.3	4.6	3.9
Professionals-Research	4.8	6.5	2.5	5.4	7.1	2.9	3.1	4.3	1.6	7.7	.5	.7	.2	13.4	20.8	6.0	1.0	1.2	.4
Professionals-Staff	3.6	3.8	3.4	4.4	4.6	4.1	1.4	1.4	1.5	3.8	.5	.6	.4	6.4	8.0	4.7	.7	.2	1.7
Technicians	8.0	7.0	9.6	7.4	6.1	9.2	10.1	9.7	10.9	1.1	5.6	5.8	5.6	20.9	15.4	26.2	11.9	12.0	11.7
Semi-Professionals	3.8	2.9	5.0	4.2	3.2	5.7	2.7	2.2	3.5	2.2	2.9	2.2	3.7	5.7	4.7	6.7	1.1	1.2	.9
Academic Manager I	1.4	2.0	.6	1.8	2.6	.8	.3	.4	.2	.5	.6	.7	.4	.3	.7	-	-	-	-
Academic Manager II	0.5	0.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.3	.4	.2	.5	.4	.6	.2	.3	.7	-	.3	.2	.4
Manager-Administrators	1.1	1.4	.8	1.3	1.5	.9	.8	1.0	.4	1.1	.8	1.1	.4	.7	.7	.7	.8	1.0	.4
Clerical Administrators	5.1	2.2	9.1	5.7	2.1	10.5	3.7	2.7	5.1	2.2	4.4	3.4	5.6	2.4	.7	4.0	3.2	2.3	5.2
Clerical I (high)	16.7	4.6	33.7	17.0	3.8	34.7	17.1	6.8	31.3	5.0	17.2	7.3	28.4	16.1	4.0	28.2	17.2	6.8	39.0
Clerical II (low)	7.2	4.7	10.8	5.5	3.0	8.9	12.0	9.3	16.1	1.6	11.5	9.0	14.7	4.7	2.7	6.7	16.5	12.4	25.1
Craftsmen	2.4	4.2	.03	2.4	4.2	.04	2.1	3.6	-	6.0	2.2	4.3	-	.7	1.3	-	2.7	3.9	-
Operatives	0.8	1.3	.03	.5	.8	.04	1.6	2.7	-	.5	1.4	2.8	-	-	-	-	2.5	3.7	-
Service, Protective	1.4	2.4	-	.5	.9	-	3.7	6.5	-	.5	5.4	10.5	-	-	-	-	3.1	4.6	-
Service, Other	11.1	12.5	9.4	4.5	4.2	4.7	29.3	34.7	22.3	4.4	37.1	39.5	35.6	-	-	-	32.3	42.9	10.0
Laborers	0.4	0.7	-	.3	.5	-	.8	1.4	-	.5	.6	1.1	-	-	-	-	1.5	2.3	-
Unclassified	1.6	0.7	1.2	1.0	.7	1.3	1.4	.5	1.0	30.6	2.1	.6	1.2	.7	-	1.3	.6	.4	.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

NA = Not Available

Table 20

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
AVERAGE SALARY FOR ALL FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME EMPLOYEES
BY OCCUPATION, SEX AND ETHNICITY

	Full-Time									Part-Time								
	Total			Majority			Minority			Total			Majority			Minority		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Professional Managers (Policy)	32,830	31,270		30,820	30,820		*	*										
Specialist Managers	11,160	11,040	11,380	11,700	12,010	11,170	10,120	9,440	11,940	8,250		8,250	7,610		7,610	*		*
Professionals-Instruction	18,380	19,270	14,580	18,520	19,400	14,510	11,130	17,570	18,630	6,200	6,440	4,970	5,670	5,780	5,040	11,570	13,050	5,270
Professionals-Research	14,090	14,220	13,690	14,440	14,660	13,710	11,750	12,580	12,200	5,040	4,890	5,340	5,570	5,630	5,480	2,380	2,250	*
Professionals-Staff	12,280	13,380	11,080	12,070	13,340	10,660	12,950	13,650	12,250	7,150	7,280	6,820	6,640	6,790	6,280	8,560	8,380	9,090
Technicians	8,540	8,630	8,430	8,410	8,620	8,150	8,700	8,650	8,750	4,670	4,780	4,590	4,920	5,310	4,820	4,500	4,650	4,320
Semi-Professionals	9,890	9,430	10,160	9,550	9,520	9,570	10,370	8,950	10,900	5,950	5,730	6,060	5,770	5,690	5,810	6,620	5,870	7,060
Academic Manager I	18,410	19,070	14,680	18,520	19,180	14,660	16,660	17,070	*	*								
Academic Manager II	13,600	13,610	13,580	12,990	12,900	13,100	15,200	15,020	15,670									
Manager-Administrators	12,110	12,710	10,680	12,330	12,770	11,200	11,120	12,210	8,690									
Clerical Administrators	9,690	10,180	9,530	9,780	10,540	9,560	9,540	9,700	9,460	6,190	5,750	6,420	5,600	4,780	6,010	7,060	7,030	7,080
Clerical I (high)	7,700	7,790	7,690	7,690	7,740	7,680	7,740	7,860	7,700	4,980	5,240	4,960	5,000	4,830	5,010	4,860	6,210	4,590
Clerical II (low)	6,570	6,600	6,560	6,440	6,560	6,370	6,700	6,650	6,740	4,290	4,430	4,250	4,080	3,550	4,170	4,990	5,450	4,640
Craftsmen	10,030	10,040	*	10,180	10,200	*	9,540	9,540										
Operatives	7,390	7,390		7,640	7,640		7,200	7,200										
Service,Protective	7,360	7,360		7,220	7,220		7,410	7,410										
Service, Other	6,800	7,050	6,400	6,790	7,180	6,360	6,800	7,030	6,410	4,210	4,310	4,160	4,150	4,360	4,030	4,300	4,160	4,340
Laborers	7,250	7,250		7,390	7,390		7,090	7,090										
Total (Average)	11,160	12,920	9,020	12,370	14,790	9,270	9,050	9,460	8,600	4,530	4,650	4,330	4,380	4,480	4,210	5,680	6,030	5,080

*= 3 or fewer persons

Table 21

SALARIES FOR ALL FULL-TIME COLUMBIA
UNIVERSITY EMPLOYEES BY SEX AND ETHNICITY

	All Info Known	Total Male	Total Female	Majority Total	Majority Male	Majority Female	Minority Total	Minority Male	Minority Female	Key
$1000-	314	90	224	185	49	136	129	41	88	RAW*
$5999	100.000	28.662	71.338	58.917	15.605	43.312	41.083	13.057	28.025	RPR**
	4.248	2.222	6.705	3.908	1.845	6.545	4.855	2.941	6.968	RPC***
$6000-	4050	1813	2237	2090	770	1320	1960	1043	917	RAW
$9999	100.000	44.765	55.235	51.605	19.012	32.593	48.395	25.753	22.642	RPR
	54.796	44.765	66.956	44.149	28.991	63.523	73.767	74.821	72.605	RPC
$10,000-	1.189	644	545	910	526	384	279	118	161	RAW
$12,999	100.000	54.163	45.837	76.535	44.239	32.296	23.465	9.924	13.541	RPR
	16.087	15.901	16.312	19.223	19.804	18.479	10.501	8.465	12.747	RPC
$13,000-	547	376	171	423	310	113	124	66	58	RAW
$15,999	100.000	68.739	31.261	77.331	56.673	20.658	22.669	12.066	10.603	RPR
	7.401	9.284	5.118	8.935	11.672	5.438	4.667	4.735	4.592	RPC
$16,000-	488	395	93	418	347	71	70	48	22	RAW
$19,999	100.000	80.943	19.057	85.656	71.107	14.549	14.344	9.836	4.508	RPR
	6.603	9.753	2.784	8.830	13.065	3.417	2.635	3.443	1.742	RPC
$20,000-	364	337	27	330	309	21	34	28	6	RAW
$24,999	100.000	92.582	7.418	90.659	84.890	5.769	9.341	7.692	1.648	RPR
	4.925	8.321	0.808	6.971	11.634	1.011	1.280	2.009	0.475	RPC
$25,000+	382	354	28	328	310	18	54	44	10	RAW
	100.000	92.670	7.330	85.864	81.152	4.712	14.136	11.518	2.618	RPR
	5.168	8.741	0.838	6.929	11.672	0.866	2.032	3.156	0.792	RPC
****NA	57	41	16	50	35	15	7	6	1	RAW
	100.000	71.930	28.070	87.719	61.404	26.316	12.281	10.526	1.754	RPR
	0.771	1.012	0.479	1.056	1.318	0.722	0.263	0.430	0.079	RPC
COLUMN	7391	4050	3341	4734	2656	2078	2657	1394	1263	RAW
SUMS	100.000	54.796	45.204	64.051	35.936	28.115	35.949	18.861	17.088	RPR
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	RPC

* Number
** Row Per Cent
*** Column Per Cent
**** NA's Excluded From All Percentages

Table 22

TOTAL, BLACK, OTHER NONWHITE, AND PUERTO RICAN POPULATION
IN NEW YORK SMSA, NEW YORK CITY AND NEARBY NEW YORK AND
NEW JERSEY COUNTIES AND CITIES, 1970

SMSA and City, County or Borough	Total population	Black population				Other nonwhite population		Puerto Rican population 1/	
		Total	% of total population	Male	Female	Total	% of total population	Total	% of total population
New York SMSA 2/	11,571,895	1,885,303	16.3	861,177	1,024,126	197,225	1.7	1,079,700	9.4
New York City	7,894,862	1,668,115	21.2	761,933	906,182	177,906	2.3	1,051,200	13.4
Manhattan	1,539,233	380,442	24.9	174,485	205,957	69,489	4.6	184,900	12.1
Bronx	1,471,701	357,681	24.3	163,547	194,134	33,161	2.3	430,500	29.2
Brooklyn	2,602,012	656,196	25.2	297,261	358,261	40,030	1.5	399,600	15.4
Queens	1,986,473	258,006	13.1	118,867	139,139	33,175	1.7	31,400	1.6
Staten Island	295,443	15,792	5.3	7,773	8,019	2,047	0.7	4,800	1.6
Other New York Counties									
Westchester	894,104	85,041	9.5	38,260	46,781	6,341	0.7	6,200	0.7
Rockland	229,903	13,128	5.7	6,244	6,884	1,150	0.5	3,600	1.6
Nassau	1,428,080	65,679	4.6	29,130	36,549	6,647	0.5	6,500	0.3
Suffolk	1,124,950	53,340	4.8	25,610	27,730	5,181	0.5	12,200	1.1
New Jersey Counties and Cities									
Bergen County	898,012	24,915	2.8	11,357	13,558	4,620	0.5	n.a.	n.a.
Hudson County	609,266	61,095	10.0	28,081	33,014	6,393	1.0	n.a.	n.a.
Jersey City	260,545	54,595	21.0	25,001	29,001	3,137	1.2	n.a.	n.a.
Essex County	929,986	279,136	30.0	129,086	150,050	9,863	1.1	n.a.	n.a.
Newark	382,417	207,458	54.2	96,349	111,109	6,577	1.7	n.a.	n.a.
Passaic County	460,782	50,199	10.9	23,319	26,880	3,650	0.8	n.a.	n.a.
Paterson	144,824	38,919	26.9	18,190	20,729	2,128	1.5	n.a.	n.a.
Clifton	82,437	267	0.3	99	168	217	0.3	n.a.	n.a.
Passaic	55,124	9,861	17.9	4,516	5,345	734	1.3	n.a.	n.a.

1. Puerto Rican data are estimates by the N.Y. Dept. of Labor and are rounded to nearest 100; roughly 4 per cent of all Puerto Ricans are classified as Black, and these 4 per cent are also included in the Black population figures.

2. Includes the five counties of New York City and Nassau, Suffolk, Westchester and Rockland Counties.

n.a. = Data not available.

Source: New York Department of Labor, Division of Employment, Minority Manpower Statistics: with special reference to their application in Affirmative Action Compliance Programs; p.4, 6; U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970, General Population Characteristics, Final Report PC (1)-B32, New Jersey, pp. 71, 182, PC (1)-B23, N.Y., pp. 87, 219, 221.

Table 23

ESTIMATED FEMALE LABOR FORCE AS A PER CENT
OF TOTAL LABOR FORCE IN NEW YORK STATE
BY REGION, SMSA[1], AND COUNTY
1970

Region, SMSA, and county	Female labor force as per cent of total
New York SMSA	40.3
New York City	43.7
Bronx	45.2
Kings	42.1
Queens	40.1
Richmond	35.3
New York	50.5
Other New York Counties	
Westchester	38.1
Rockland	33.4
Nassau	31.4
Suffolk	29.3
New Jersey SMSA's	
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic SMSA	34.5
Newark SMSA	36.2
Jersey City SMSA	32.2
NY - NJ Consolidated Area	39.2

Source: New York and New Jersey Departments of Labor, unpublished data.

1. SMSA = Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Table 24

WOMEN AND MINORITY GROUPS AS A PERCENTAGE OF EMPLOYEES
IN REPORTING PRIVATE AND NONPROFIT ENTERPRISES
NEW YORK SMSA[1], 1967

Occupational Group	Women Total	Black		Spanish-surnamed American		Oriental		American Indian	
		Total	Women	Total	Women	Total	Women	Total	Women
Total	38.2	10.6	5.1	6.5	2.4	0.6	0.2	0.1	*
White Collar	45.1	6.4	4.4	3.1	1.6	0.7	0.2	0.1	*
Officials & managers	14.0	1.8	0.7	1.2	0.2	0.3	*	0.0	*
Professionals	21.8	3.6	2.2	1.6	0.5	1.6	0.5	0.0	*
Technicians	23.2	8.3	4.1	3.7	1.1	1.3	0.4	0.0	*
Salesworkers	34.3	4.5	2.5	2.6	1.1	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1
Office & clerical	70.5	9.4	7.0	4.4	2.8	0.4	0.3	0.1	*
Blue Collar	21.6	14.9	4.7	12.6	4.4	0.3	0.1	0.1	*
Craftsmen	7.9	6.6	1.2	5.7	1.5	0.4	*	0.1	*
Operatives	29.2	17.0	6.0	15.6	6.0	0.3	0.1	0.1	*
Laborers	28.0	23.7	7.4	17.5	5.7	0.2	*	0.2	*
Service Workers	35.7	29.7	12.8	14.1	2.8	0.5	0.1	0.2	*

*=less than 0.05%.

NOTES

[1]NYSMSA=New York City and Nassau, Rockland, Suffolk, and Westchester Counties.

Source: U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Equal Employment Opportunity Report No. 2, Job Patterns for Minorities and Women in Private Industry, 1967, Vol. 2, p. 564.